Sherlock Union Theol. Sem (6) 114 C.
Adv.

THE

Doctrine of the Holy Trinity

Placed in its due Light,

BY AN

ANSWER

To a Late Book, Entituled,

ANIMADVERSIONS *upon Dr.* Sherlock's *Book*, &c.

ALSO

The Doctrine of the INCARNATION of our Lord Asserted and Explain'd.

(Wm Sherlock)

LONDON:
Printed in the Year MDCXCIV.

LIBRARY OF THE
UNION
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.
NEW YORK.

THE CONTENTS.

THE *Occaſion and Deſign of the Work.* Pag. 3.
The Animadverter's *Hypotheſis conſidered.*

1. *It contradicteth his own Definition of a* PERSON, *which he ſaith importeth the ſame in Beings Rational, as* SUPPOSITUM *doth in Beings not Rational. If ſo, then Three Perſons in the Divine Nature muſt be Three Subſtances.* 6.

2. *It contradicteth the Laws of* Relation; *which of all Accidents moſt requireth a Subject: And there muſt be as many Subjects as Correlates.* 9.

3. *A* MODE *is too mean to ſupport the Character of a* PERSON.

Fathers and Councils, &c. *appealed to. But* 13.

He confeſſeth the Doctrine not ſetled till about 600 *years after Chriſt: And the* Greek *Fathers call them* Hypoſtaſes, *which word is examined by the uſe of Former Ages.* 2. *By Scripture.* 3. *By the Explications of Fathers themſelves.*

The Latin *Churches followed St.* Auguſtin: *Who ſo canvaſſeth the word as to leave it no more than Dr.* Wallis's Somewhat. 17.

Our own beſt Divines (particularly our Moſt Reverend Primate) give it the ſame latitude. 19.

The Unitarians *Objection conſidered.* 20.

To find WHAT are the three, our beſt way is to enquire WHO are the three.

St. Auguſtin *Rational in the Attempt; unproſperous in the Performance.* 22.

Herein

Herein he acted not as a Christian Father, but as a Philosopher. Page 23.
The Point in Question, is, Whether they be Internal or External Relations. 25.
The words of St. John, 1 John 5. 8. *exhibit the same Trinity with the* Platonists. 26.
This acknowledged by some of the Fathers, and our best Moderns. 28.
This Trinity both Necessary and Sufficient, as well for Christian Faith as Natural Theology. 32.
The Church of England *appealed to, and Her First Article explained.* 33.
The two Rival Hypotheses tried upon a Philosopher, or Deist. 40.
And compared together between themselves. 41.
Objections answered. 43.
Address to all Rational men, that they need not scruple the Athanasian *Creed.* 46.

Of the Doctrine of the Incarnation.

That the Beginning of St. John's *Gospel is to be Interpreted by what the* Platonists *said of the* λόγος. 48.
The Socinians *Interpretation Confuted.* 51.
The Church of England's *Second Article Explained.* 60.
The word PERSON *may comprehend many Substances, as in Corporations.* 62.
In such cases Each one retaineth its Properties, yet communicateth with other Members of the Corporation in what belongeth to the whole. 63.
Satisfaction offered to those who scruple at our Litany. 64.
Yea, though we should mistake the Apostle's meaning. 66.
The dangers on both sides to be well weighed. 67.

THE

THE Animadverter's DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY TRINITY Considered.

AMONG all the *Greek* Fathers, there was not a greater, either in Learning or Piety, than Saint *Greg. Naz.* who made a Panegyrical Oration in praiſe of St. *Athanaſius*, which he cloſed with this, as the beſt of his Performances, and a Patern for all Ages, That he made peace between the *Greek* and *Latin* Churches; which tho' they agreed againſt the *Arians* in the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, yet differed in the word whereby they would expreſs *What the Three* are.

The *Greeks* would call them ὑποστάσεις; This the *Latines* rejected, as tending to *Arianiſm*; The *Latins* would ſtile them *Perſons*; This the *Greeks* excepted againſt, as ſavouring of *Sabelliſm*: And thus (ſaith the good Father) *the world was in danger to be torn in pieces by Syllables: But* Athanaſius, *as a true man of* God, *and Steward of Souls,* — *ſpeedily applied a remedy: Kindly and gently taking to him both Parties, and carefully examining the minds of both; ſeeing he found them agree in the meaning, he indulged the Word, and obliged them to the Thing: This is much more advantageous than thoſe long Labours and Diſcourſes, which now all men ſcribble, which are always mixed with ſomething of vain-glory, and therefore ſomething is innovated in the meaning: This is more to be valued than many watchings and toils; this is as much worth as his celebrated baniſhments and flights.*

 That

That the Caſe is now the ſame with Us, is but too plain to every one that hath read or heard of the *Animadverſions upon Dr.* Sherlock's *Book, entituled, A Vindication of the Holy and ever Bleſſed Trinity*, &c. Both theſe Authors are equally zealous for the *Unity of God, and Trinity of Perſons*; but concerning the word PERSONS there's a wide difference and high conteſt between them.

The *Vindicator* finding the *Socinians* buſy to oppoſe the Eſtabliſh'd Doctrine, thought it neceſſary to defend it; but conſidering withal, that this had been ſo often and ſo fully done by others in the ordinary way, that he muſt ſeem no better than a *Plagiary*, unleſs he offered ſomething that others had omitted; and finding, that however much had been written to aſſert *Three Perſons*, yet none had ſtated the meaning of the word, which is the proper *Subject* of the Diſpute; thought it a work worthy of his Pen, to ſupply that great defect. And thus far (doubtleſs) he was right: But his next ſtep carried him too far; he advanced a New and unjuſtifiable Notion, That the *Three Perſons* are no leſs than *three Spirits and three Minds*; *Several* by *Self-conſciouſneſs*, and *One* by *Mutual conſciouſneſs*.

This Notion, being the iſſue of his own thoughts, ſo pleaſed him, as to make him believe it beſt explained the Myſtery, to the ſatisfaction of the *Catholicks*, and conviction of the *Socinians*; but the ſucceſs proved contrary in both: *Theſe* were hardened, and *Thoſe* were offended; yet without much noiſe; till after three years, the *Animadverter* thought fit to expoſe it, as he hath done, with great *Learning and Wit*, but greater *Severity*.

Should Dr. *Sherlock* reply in the ſame tone, there is great danger, that this new Queſtion ſhould raiſe great Trouble, or at leaſt great Scandal. But if the *Animadverter* ſo oppoſe One Extream, as to advance the Contrary, it is to be hoped, that by reducing them to the middle, we may reconcile them; and which is much better, we may alſo reconcile

cile to the *Doctrine* it ſelf, all thoſe who, for its ſake, think the worſe of the whole *Chriſtian Religion*, whereof it is ſaid to be a *Fundamental*.

That *One God hath three Perſons*, is to *Jews* and *Mahumetans* a Scandal; to *Deiſts*, a Deriſion; to *Socinians*, a Contradiction: and to its Believers, a *Myſtery*: But I hope to make it appear, that in the whole Queſtion there is nothing ſo *Myſterious*, as the Silence of ſo many, and ſo Diſputatious Ages, in That which ought in the firſt place to have been either *Agreed*, or *Argued*: For, I believe, this is the only Queſtion in the world, which hath ſuffered any great diſpute, without ſtating its Subject. How can we reaſonably affirm or deny, that there are three *Perſons*, before we know what a *Perſon is?* The *Subject* of a Doctrine is the *Foundation* whereon it is built: Without due ſetling of This, it is a *Caſtle in the Air*; he that diſputeth For, or Againſt it, *fighteth like one that beateth the air*; and what wonder, if thoſe who have wearied themſelves in ſo doing, have had nothing but their labour for their pains?

But now, that One Doctor hath Given, and the Other Taken occaſion, to examine the Fundamental term, PERSON; whatever judgement we paſs upon their *Performances*, we owe them our thanks for their *Attempt*; ſeeing thereby they have ſhown us the only way, wherein we may hope to find (what the Animadverter promiſes) *a fairer and more conſiſtent account, than the ableſt Divines have given us.*

The *Vindicator's Hypotheſis* of *thre Spirits and three Minds*, I take to be ſo utterly demoliſh'd, that there needs not a word on That ſide. But the *Animadverter* hath been ſo much happier at That work, than at Building; and hath gone ſo far from One extream to Another, that I ſhall deal with His work in the ſame kind (the Anger always excepted); And, that done, ſhall venture to offer my own ſentiments.

That

That I may be ſecure from all ſuſpicion of miſrepreſenting, take his own words as they ſtand, *p.* 120.

If it be here objected, that we allow of three diſtinct Perſons in the Godhead, of which every one is Infinite, without admitting them to be three diſtinct Gods; and therefore why may we not as well allow of three Infinite diſtinct Minds or Spirits in the ſame Godhead, without any neceſſity of inferring from thence, that they are three diſtinct Gods?

I anſwer, That the Caſe is very different: And the reaſon of the Difference is this, Becauſe three Infinite Minds or Spirits are three Abſolute Simple Beings, and ſo ſtand diſtinguiſhed from one another by their whole Beings or Natures. But the Divine Perſons are three Relatives ——— *and conſequently differ from one another, not wholly and by all that is in them, but only by ſome certain Mode*, &c.

Which Diſtinction he had alſo urged by way of Argument, pag. 98. *Nothing in the Nature of it Abſolute, can be the Formal Reaſon of any thing in the Nature of it purely and perfectly Relative* ——— *and that the Perſons in the Bleſſed Trinity are purely and perfectly Relative to one another, and conſequently that their Perſonalities are ſo many Relations, is no leſs evident by this, that two of them relate to one another as Father and Son, and the third to Both as proceeding from Both* ——— *ſo that the very Perſonal Subſiſtence of theſe Perſons implies and carries with it a formal Relation*, &c.

This is the very Soul and Life of the new *Hypotheſis*, it runs throughout the whole Book, and requires our utmoſt application.

I therefore deny his Fundamental Aſſertion, *That the caſe is very different*; and the Reaſon of my denying this Difference, is, becauſe he himſelf denieth it.

For as he is very regular in uſhering his Diſpute with a ſettlement of the terms; ſo he hath among the reſt, ſtated the Cardinal word whereon the whole queſtion turneth, the word PERSON: In the Definition where-

of

of we find not the leaſt air of a *Relative*, but a full account of an *Abſolute Being*, in theſe words, *Page* 35. *As a Suppoſitum is Subſtantia ſingularis completa per ſe ſubſiſtens; ſo the ratio intellectiva being added to this, makes it a Perſon; which is a further perfection of Suppoſitality, and the utmoſt perfection of Subſiſtence; as Subſiſtence and Suppoſitality is the utmoſt bound and perfection of Exiſtence in all Beings not Intelligent.*

By this account, *Perſon and Suppoſitum* are but two Names of the ſame thing; they differ in *Metaphyſicks*, but as Colours do in *Heraldry*; what in a Subject's Coat of Arms is but *Metal* at beſt, in the *Prince*'s is no leſs than a Star; but (take heed) they muſt not be *Blazon'd* by the ſame Syllables. This we have again, *Page* 223. *As for the terms Subſiſtence and Perſonality, they import the laſt and utmoſt completion of the Exiſtence of things, by vertue whereof they exiſt by themſelves* ——— *of which two modes, Perſonality belongs only to Intelligent Beings; but Subſiſtence to all others, to whom the aforeſaid Definition does agree: And this is the true proper difference and diſtinction between theſe two.*

Here again we have them compriſed in the ſame *Definition*, *the utmoſt completion of the Exiſtence of things:* And what this *Exiſtence* is, we find *Page*. 33. viz. *That Mode or Affection of Being, by which a thing ſtands actually produced out of the power of its cauſes; or at leaſt not actually included in any cauſe, in which ſenſe God himſelf does Exiſt.*

Hath this Notion of *Relative* given our Author a new kind of Jaundice, that maketh every thing appear of that colour? If God hath *Exiſtence*, and no Cauſes, why muſt the one be defined by the other? And why muſt we have ſuch a Definition, as muſt exclude the moſt Perfect of the things defined? Is not this done on purpoſe to divert us from thinking of a nearer *Relation*, that is between *Exiſtence* and *Eſſence?* For all Learned men ſay, there is ſuch kindred between theſe two, that *Eſſence* importeth an *Univerſal*

Na-

Nature, abſtracted from all Individuals; and Exiſtence ſignifieth *Individual Nature* fixed in *Particulars*. So *Eſſence* is only the *Hope of Exiſtence*; and *Exiſtence* is the *enjoyment of Eſſence*. The Former is by the *Peripateticks* ſaid to be *Ens rationis*, a Creature of mans mind; by the *Platoniſts* it is allowed a Reality, but only in *Idea*, which, though *Real*, is a very *Incompleat* kind of Being.

But when this *Eſſence* proceedeth to *Actual Exiſtence*, and thereby obtaineth a place in the liſt of *viſible Creatures*; then is it compleated, and can proceed no *Further*, though it may ſpread it ſelf *Wider*: It can do no more than produce an *Actual Being of its own kind*, though it may produce *Innumerable* ſuch.

But *Exiſtence* it ſelf is compleated at once. It conſiſts in a *Point* without latitude; the firſt moment gives it full Stature, for there is no middle between *Exiſtent* and *Non-Exiſtent*.

If therefore there be ſuch a parity between *Suppoſitum* and *Perſona*, as our Author hath defined; then muſt he compound with Dr. *Sherlock*, becauſe every *Perſon* in the Holy Trinity muſt be a *Mind or Spirit*; for that the *Divine Nature* cannot be compleated by any Being *Inferior* to its ſelf, much leſs by any Mode of Being: And *Both of them* muſt agree with the *Deiſt*, acknowledging but *One Perſon in the Godhead*; becauſe the *Divine Nature*, being *Eternally Compleat*, is not capable of being again compleated by a *Perſonal Exiſtence*.

For my part, I plead neither the One nor the Other of theſe Conſequences: For I pretend not to ſtrain the word *Perſon* ſo high as to make it *Uniſon* with *Suppoſitum*: But this I claim as a plain inference from the Author's ſo doing, that the One be as *Abſolute a Being* as the Other: And *Exiſtence* or *Completion of Exiſtence* (I am ſure) imports as *Abſolute Being*, as any thing can enjoy. And thus I have our Author's own hand to warrant my denial of his great diffe-

difference between *Three Spirits and Three Perſons*, becauſe *Perſonality* importeth a *Being* as *Abſolute* as *Exiſtence*.

This will appear yet plainer by exemplifying his Diſcourſe. *That the Perſons in the Bleſſed Trinity are purely relative* ——— *is no leſs evident by this, that two of them relate to one another as Father and Son, and a Third to Both, as proceeding from Both; ſo that*, &c. Goodly! Abraham *and* Iſaac *were related to one another as Father and Son, and* Jacob *to Both as proceeding from Both; ſo that the very Perſonal Subſiſtences of theſe Perſons, implied and carried with them Formal Relations: Theſe therefore were not ſeveral Men*, (if we believe our Author) *becauſe ſeveral Men are ſeveral Abſolute Beings*; Is not this admirable?

This to poor Us of the Vulgar is very ſurprizing: For we have not the art to diſcover any ſuch *Difference* between *Relatives* and *Strangers*; as to enable us to diſtinguiſh them, either from one another, or from other men: Nor between *Relation* and other *Accidents*, but this, that it is ſlighter than any other: For *Other Accidents* import ſomething *Real* in their Subject: But a new *Relation* giveth only a new *Name*: He that hath a Son, hath a new *Relation*, but not a new Hair, or ſo much as a new Colour in any one of his Hairs. But in This, *Relation* agreeth with all other *Accidents*, that it cannot ſubſiſt without a *Subject*, nor conſiſt with an *Oppoſite* in the ſame Subject: The *Father* muſt be One man and the *Son* Another, becauſe the ſame man cannot be Father, or Son to Himſelf: *Abſolutely* Two Men, for This very reaſon, becauſe they are *Correlates*.

This is ſo much the more unanſwerable, becauſe our Author himſelf foundeth the Number of the Perſons in the Holy Trinity upon ſuch their Inconſiſtence: eſpecially Page 244. *Becauſe the ſame Perſons may ſuſtain ſeveral Perſonal Relations, and Exert and Receive ſeveral Acts, where thoſe Acts and Relations are not Oppoſite and inconſiſtent with*

one another in the ſame Subject: And in the ſame *Page* by way of Axiom; *Relations merely Diſparate do not conſtitute ſeveral diſtinct Perſons, unleſs they be Oppoſite too.*

I will not allow time and words to diſpute, that the Act of *Exerting or Receiving*, muſt require a Subject Præexiſting, becauſe it muſt firſt *Be*, before it can *do* either of them; but This I do inſiſt upon, That all *Relations* and *Relatives* (as ſuch) muſt have a double aſpect, the One upon the *Subject*, whereon it is founded; and the Other upon the *Correlate*, to which it is *Oppoſed*: And that upon this it will neceſſarily follow, that if the *Perſons* be *Relatives*, each of them muſt be ſo *Oppoſite* to the other two, that they cannot All ſubſiſt in the ſame *Subſtance*. For every *Diſtinct Perſon* muſt have its *Diſtinct*, yea its *Oppoſite Relation*, and every *Relation* muſt have its *diſtinct Subject*: which in *Divine Perſons* can be no other than the *Divine Nature* or *Subſtance*.

And now, if the account be well caſt up, What will our Author gain by his Diſtinction? Even this, that *three Abſolute Beings are only Diſparate*. But three *Relatives* are ſo *Oppoſite* as to be incompoſſible. And therefore if *Three Spirits* or *Minds* cannot be *One God*; much leſs can three *Correlates*.

We have ſaid that *Every Relation* muſt be founded upon its *Subject*, and our Author hath found a proper one, *viz. A mode of Subſiſtence*, whereof we have this ſhort account, *Page* 240. That *albeit according to the reality of the Thing the Subſiſtence and Relation of each Perſon make but one ſingle indiviſible mode of Being; yet according to the Natural order of conceiving things, we muſt firſt conceive of the Subſiſtence, as precedent to the Relation.* If we take the whole circumference, it is this, A *Subſiſtence is a Mode of Exiſtence*, Page 31. *Perſons* are conſtituted by different *modes of Subſiſtence*. The *modes of Subſiſtence are Relative*; ſo the *Subſiſtence and Relation is one ſingle indiviſible mode of being*: and

and the Hypothesis hangs (as the Globe of the earth doth) upon its indivisible center *Mode*: and what that is, he thus proceeds to discourse.

They are not Beings properly so called: And in things Spiritual and immaterial, a Mode seemeth to have much the like reference to such kinds of Being that a Posture hath to a Body, to which it giveth some Difference or Distinction, without superadding any new Entity or Being to it, &c.

No wonder if *Dr. Sherlock* was dissatisfied with so mean an account of *Personality*; and Objected against it; *No man can think that the Father begat only a Modus, and called it a Son, whereas a Son signifieth a Real Person, of the same Nature, but distinct from the Father.* To this our Author answereth, *None that He knows is in danger of saying or thinking so; no more than that* Socrates *begat only the Shadow and Figure of a man, and called That his Son ——— Nevertheless, I hope it will be granted me that* Socrates *might beget one of such a shape and figure, and (by this Author's and* Xantippe's *good leave) call That his Son.*

I know one that is in danger, or more than danger, of thinking that the *Animadverter* himself saith no more nor less than so, when he saith a Person is no more than a Mode. And whereas he presumes upon the *Author's and Xantippe's good leave*, it is sure enough, the *latter* would grant no leave, to have her Son disparag'd, and his fortune spoil'd, by an information, that he was not a sufficient *Man*, but mere *Shape and Figure.* And the *Former* in his own *Vindication*, may read his Author such a Lecture, as may make him have great need of the patience of *Socrates.*

What in the next *Page* our Author informs the Dr. *That the Father communicateth his Nature under a different mode of Subsistence from what it hath in himself, to* ANOTHER; *and that such a communication of it in such a peculiar way, is properly called his Begetting a Son ——— and if the Doctor have any thing to except against it, he shall not fail*

of an Answer: Though I have no title to this promise, I am bold to offer this Question: To what *Other*, and How doth the Father communicate his Nature? To another Person made so by another *Nature?* This indeed *Socrates* did, and all humane Fathers do: The *Father* always so communicates his *Specifick* nature to his Son, that thereby the Son obtaineth another *Numerical* nature of his own. Will he say this of *God the Father?* No, there is but *One Numerical* nature in *All the Three Persons*: The Question therefore is still repeated: To another *What?* Answer if you can, what Other is there besides the other Mode of Subsistence?

That the Argument may appear worth a Formal Answer, let us put it into this Syllogism.

He that begetteth not a new Substance, nor a new Accident, but only a distinct mode of Subsistence in the same Substance, begetteth no more than a new Mode.

God the Father begetteth not any new Substance, nor any new Accident, but only a new mode of Subsistence in the same substance.

Therefore God the Father begetteth no more than a new Mode.

Both the *Premises* are his own: The *Major* p. 31. where all sorts of Beings are reduced to *Substances*, *Accidents*, *or Modes:* The *Minor* runneth throughout all the Book, and all the World: Yea, the very *Conclusion* is his own: For tho he sometimes would shun it, yet he oftener affirmeth, nay, it is the substance of his Hypothesis, That the Son is no more than another *Mode of Subsistence* in the same *Substance:* Which is a mere *Mode* of speaking without any *Substance* of Truth to support it.

And now I hope it plainly appears, that these two Learned Doctors ought to shake hands, saying mutually

—— *Ve-*

———*Veniam petimuſque damuſque viciſſim.*

For as the *Animadverter* hath utterly deſtroyed the *Vindicator*'s Hypotheſis of *three Spirits and three Minds*; ſo hath the *Vindicator* done the ſame for the *Animadverter's three Relations and Modes of Subſiſtence.*

BUT before the Controverſy be determined, it muſt be pleaded at another Bar: Both ſides appeal to *Fathers and Councils*; which becauſe the *Animadverter* is more particular in quoting (and the others which are not quoted by him are eaſily anſwer'd) I ſhall take no notice but of thoſe only which he mentioneth, and very little of them neither. For he hath been very kind in ſuperſeding a great deal of needleſs labour, by quitting more than 1000 years: Saying, *pag.* 270. *The main proof of the point driven at, I ſtate upon the Later Ages of the Catholick Church; concerning which I dare and do affirm, that for the five or ſix laſt Centuries, the ſaid terms have been univerſally received and uſed by Divines in their Writings and Diſcourſes about the Trinity; all ſtating the Perſonality and Diſtinction of the Divine Perſons upon ſo many diſtinct Subſiſtences and Modes of Subſiſtence: Therein following the* Greek *Fathers, who were much more verſed in this Controverſy, and managed it much better and more exactly than the Ancient Latins did.*

To the *Greeks* then let us go, if it be worth our labour: For he giveth us this cold incouragement, *p.* 258. *Nevertheleſs I muſt and do confeſs it very probable that the more diſtinct and exact uſe of the terms* ὑπόστασις *and* τρόποι ὑπάρξεως, *as applied to the Divine Perſons, did not generally and commonly take place, but as by degrees the diſcuſſion of the* Arian *and other like Controverſies, through frequent Diſputes, grew to ſtill greater and greater maturity. And that the uſe of theſe terms did obtain Then, and upon That account, I think a very conſiderable Argument, to authorize and recommend them to all ſober and judicious Minds.*

But

But I dare not deny all thoſe to be *Sober and Judicious*, who refuſe to entertain them upon ſuch Recommendations. The five or ſix laſt Centuries in the *Latin*, and the 5th or 6th Century after the firſt in the *Greek* Church, ſome Judicious Man may reject, as coming too late to give a Doctrine the Title of *Catholick*; much more, that of *Fundamental*: And another will think it the leſs Venerable for ripening by degrees; and That, by no better heat than the *Diſputacity of Doctors*: Some think it might better become the Doctrines of the *Chriſtian Religion*, to be built as the *Temple of God* was, without any *noiſe of axes or hammers*: And I have heard ſome men (whether *Judicious* or no I dare not determine) ſay, the Queſtion was not decided by the *Pen*, but the *Sword*; nor by *Reaſon*, but *Intereſt*: Becauſe the contending Parties ſtill prevailed or ſubmitted in *Councils*, as the *Emperours* ſmil'd or frown'd; and at laſt was determined by the *Edict* of an *Emperour*, that reigned ſo long as to give a further eſtabliſhment by *Preſcription*. And others are ſo bold as to ſay, that if it were decided only by *Diſputes*, it may undergo a review; both becauſe the world is by age grown much more skilful than it was in thoſe times, if we may judge by what is left of the Works of the *Fathers*; and becauſe we may be more ſecure of mens *Sincerity* now; ſeeing (at leaſt in our Church) they lie not under thoſe temptations wherewith former Ages were biaſſed.

But tho' I dare not deny ſuch men to be *Sober or Judicious*, that enter ſuch Caveats, I demur not to the *Juriſdiction* appealed to; but ſubmit to the deciſion of thoſe very *Fathers and Councils* which the *Animadverter* quotes.

And in the firſt place, the *Greeks* are not pretended to have ſpoken a ſyllable of *Relations*, but to have ſtated *Perſonality* upon *Subſiſtence* and *Modes of Subſiſtence*.

Concerning the Former, there appeareth *a cloud of Witneſſes*; but what ſay they? even this and no more, that there

there is *one Eſſence and three Hypoſtaſes*; but that by *Hypoſtaſes* they meant no more than *Subſiſtences*, in ſuch a ſenſe as the *Latins* have *arbitrarily* and lately affixed to the word; Of this, not the leaſt mention.

Oh the wonderful effect of *Diſpute!* It is often ſpoken of with wonder, that two Learned Brothers, thereby ſhifted *Religions*; the one converted from the *Reformed* Religion to the *Roman*, the other from the *Roman* to the *Reformed*: But here we ſee a greater wonder; The ſame Doctor putteth the two rival terms *Perſon*, and *Subſiſtence*, upon ſuch a countermarch, that they do not only change places, but either of them goeth much beyond the place where the other ſtood.

The *Greeks* of old thought the word *Perſon* ſignified *too little*, and therefore ſtuck to the word *Hypoſtaſis*; yet now we find a *Perſon* no leſs than an *Intelligent ſubſtance*: The *Latins* thought the word *Hypoſtaſis* ſignified *too much*: And now it is made import no more than *Subſiſtence*; *i.e.* than a *Mode*, for ſo we find it defined, *p.* 34.

Since therefore it is evident that for our right underſtanding of the *Greek* Fathers minds, we muſt take their word in That ſenſe which they contended for; not in That which the *Latins*, by mere Arbitrary power, ſix or ſeven hundred years afterward, impoſed upon it: It is neceſſary we ſeek out the ſenſe it bore in Their times, whoſe Authority is urged for proof of the point in queſtion. The very *Zeal* which the *Greeks* had for it, and the *Jealouſy* which the *Latins* had againſt it, by the Teſtimony of St. *Greg. Naz.* is Evidence ſufficient, that it then ſignified more Than ſuch a *Mode*, as it is now reduced to. But if we will require a more particular account, we muſt conſult, 1. The uſe of it in the *ſame and former Ages*. 2. The uſe of it in the *New Teſtament*. 3. The Explications of the *Perſons themſelves*.

1. Concerning the firſt of theſe, we have a Criticiſm of *Socrat.* Hiſt. lib. 3. cap. 5. which the Reader may turn

to

to at his leiſure: But the ſum of it is this, That none of all the ſenſes wherein it was us'd, did agree with the preſent Eccleſiaſtical One. In ſuch an uncertainty therefore we muſt needs ſearch further.

2. And where an Article of the *Chriſtian Religion* is concerned, no Authority can be equal to His, who preached *That Religion*, among the People of *That Language*, and uſed it no leſs than three ſeveral times, always in the ſame ſenſe, importing *Eminence* in That property which is moſt eſſential to the Subject whereunto it is applied. The utmoſt of *Boaſting* is *Confidence*, and that is expreſſed by ὑποστάσει τῆς καυχήσεως, 2 Cor. XI. 17. The top of *Hope* is *Aſſurance*, and *Faith* is ὑπόστασις τῶν ἐλπιζομένων, *Heb.* XI. 1. The higheſt Elogy which can be given our Saviour, is, the *Brightneſs of his father's glory, the expreſs character of his* ὑπόστασις, Heb. I. 3. Where the word is tranſlated *Perſon*, and requireth a ſenſe agreeable to what it had, when it was aſcribed to *Boaſting and Faith*; which, as on One ſide they have no *Suſtance*; ſo on the Other, are more than mere *Modes*.

3. But undoubtedly the Adæquate Determiners of the meaning of any word muſt be the *Perſons themſelves*, if ever they profeſs to explain it, eſpecially if they do it by accompanying it with equivalent words, and an *alias*; as was carefully done by the Emperor *Juſtinian* and his *Council*, quoted by the Author. Ἐν τρισὶν ὑποστάσεσιν ἤτοι προσώποις· And again, τριάδα δὲ κατὰ τὰς ἰδιότητας, ἤγουν ὑποστάσεις ἤτοι πρόσωπα· And again, Μίαν θεότητα ἐν τρισὶν ὑπόστασεσιν ἤτοι προσώποις προσκυνητήν. Such is his proof for the ſenſe of his *Latin Subſiſtence*.

But then for his other term *Modes of Subſiſtence*, which is a Mode upon a Mode, we find not That ſo honoured, as to ride ſide by ſide with an ἤτοι, as an equivalent exegeſis to ὑπόστασις. He voucheth no other Patron for that term, but *Juſtin Martyr*, who doth indeed imploy it, but as a *Servant*, not an *Equal* to ὑπόστασις, in theſe words, οὐ σαυτὸν τῷ πατρὶ

ὁ υἱος

ὁ υἱὸς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ἅγιον, ὅτι τὸ μὲν γέννητον καὶ ἀγέννητον καὶ ἐκπορευτὸν ἐκ οὐσίας ὀνόμαται, ἀλλὰ τρόποι τῆς ὑπάρξεως; As we find not here the word ὑπόστασις mentioned, ſo do we not find the new word ὕπαρξις made Equivalent to it; but a mere mark of difference, whereby the *Perſons* may be diſtinguiſhed from the *Eſſence*: Nor do we in other Fathers find it otherwiſe honoured; So that the *Greeks*, with all this good management, come ſhort of our Author's purpoſe, and leave the ſenſe of the word in (the uſual place of Truth) the *middle*, between the two *extreams*. Not ſo much as the *Vindicator's three Minds*, nor ſo little as the *Animadverter's three Modes*.

LET US now accompany our Author, who ſaith, *p.* 262. *So I paſs from the* Greeks *to the* Latins, *whom we ſhall find giving account of the ſame, partly by Subſiſtences and modes of Subſiſtence, and partly by Relations: But not equally by Both in all Ages of the Church.*

We ſhall not trouble our ſelves with his *Late Latins*; partly becauſe their Authority is not worth it, and eſpecially becauſe we find their Sentiments in thoſe of the great St. *Auguſtin*, their Oracle, who wrote fifteen Books *de Trinitate*, wherein he induſtriouſly gives and inculcates a full account of the now diſputed word, in perfect agreement with the equally-great St. *Gregory Nazianzen*. Both of them profeſs that it was taken up by the *Latins* upon *neceſſity*, driven thereunto by the ſcantneſs of the *Latin* Tongue, which afforded no better, whereby to tranſlate that which in *Greek* ſignified *Subſtance*. For thus he ſpeaketh;

Lib. 7. cap. 4. *By the* Greeks *it was ſaid One Eſſence, three Subſtances; by the Latins, One Eſſence or Subſtance, three Perſons; becauſe in our Language,* i. e. *the Latin, Eſſence is no other way to be uſed than Subſtance. But that we may underſtand (however darkly) what is ſpoken, we have choſen ſo to ſpeak, that ſomething may be ſaid, when it is asked what are the three, which Faith declareth to be three?* ——

when therefore it is demanded what are the three? we betake our ſelves to find out ſome general or ſpecial name —— therefore by neceſſity of ſpeaking and diſputing we may lawfully call them three PERSONS, not becauſe the Scripture ſaith it, but becauſe it doth not gainſay it —— that there are not TRIA QUÆDAM, three Somewhats, he could not ſay, which becauſe Sabellius *ſaid, he fell into Hereſy.*

Again, cap. 9. *When it is asked what three? man's Language ſuffereth great ſtreights: Yet we ſay three Perſons; not becauſe That ought to be ſaid, but becauſe ſomething muſt be ſaid.*

And now is it not worth our *Labour*, yea is it not worth our *Charity*, to diſpute about the meaning of a word, which was therefore choſen becauſe it had no fixed meaning at all? To build an *Article of our Faith* upon a word, which was uſed, *not becauſe That ought to be ſaid, but becauſe ſomething muſt be ſaid*, to ſtop the mouth of an importunate Diſputer, not to ſatisfy the Conſcience of a modeſt Learner? To exact a punctual account of *what are* thoſe *three*, which the Fathers could no otherwiſe deſcribe, than by ſaying they are three SOMEWHATS?

What St. *Auguſtin* thus determined, or rather left undetermined by diſcourſe, the Emperor *Theodoſius* did implicitly by his *Edict*, after the Doctrine had been ſifted by another hundred years diſpute. This great Emperor reſolved to bring all his Subjects to his own *Religion*, and to that end made this Edict, *That all muſt embrace that Religion which* Peter *the Prince of the Apoſtles had delivered to the* Romans, *and which at that time* Damaſus *Biſhop of* Rome, *and* Peter *Biſhop of* Alexandria, *maintained: And that thoſe Churches only ſhould be called Catholick, that worſhipped the Trinity with equal honour; and thoſe that thought otherwiſe ſhould be called Hereticks, excommunicated, and puniſhed*, Sozom. VII. 4.

Rigid

Rigid enough! yet favourable enough! He required no more to make a good *Catholick*, but this, that he *worſhip the Trinity with equal honour*, without declaring what are the Three to whom this *equal worſhip* is paid; whether three *Minds*, or three *Modes*.

With the ſame moderation have our moſt eminent *Divines* treated this Article: I name but One, when One is equivalent to a multitude: Our moſt Reverend Archbiſhop thus ſtateth the Doctrine and the Word together, *Serm.* 2. *Here then I fix my foot; That there are three Differences in the Deity, which the Scripture ſpeaks of by the names of Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt; and every-where ſpeaks of them as of Perſons: and therefore I ſee no reaſon, why in this Argument we ſhould nicely abſtain from uſing the word* PERSON.

No Reaſon certainly, if we take the word in its genuine latitude: But we do not always ſpeak to *Criticks*; And That definition which the *Animanverter*, and the generality of the Learned give it, *viz.* an *Intelligent Suppoſitum*, or *Subſtantia ſingularis completa*, &c. made ſuch deep impreſſion on us when we firſt delivered up our Underſtandings to *Syſtems*, that the very *ſyllables* ſurprize us with a notion of an *intelligent individuum*.

If this be not reaſon ſufficient for the diſuſe of ſo dangerous a word; it is certainly for miniſtring it with ſuch an *Antidote*, as may prevent its ill effects. Of this caution we ſaw an Example in *Juſtinian*, and his Council; and had it been conſtantly practiſed, the *Chriſtian Religion* had not loſt ſo many fair Countries to the *Mahumetans*, who hearing of *three Perſons*, whereof every one is *God*; and taking the word in its now Vulgar ſenſe, immediatly infer that we believe *three Gods*.

How the *Socinians*, or (as they ſtile themſelves) the *Unitarians*, will entertain theſe three *Differences* or *Somewhats* (as Dr. *Wallis* words them) a little time will diſcover. It was not long ſince they ſo briskly accepted the Doctor's Propoſal, That

in their *Obſervations upon his former Letters* they ſaid, *If it be below his Character and Dignity to permit himſelf to be called a* Sabellian *or a* Socinian; *the* Sabellians *and* Socinians *in honour of him are content to be called* Walliſians: But this Complement they ſoon retracted; for in another Paper, entituled, *The Unreaſonableneſs of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, &c. they ſpeak againſt theſe *Somewhats*, as an impoſition, becauſe they ſay Words are but noiſe, or worſe, when they fix no *Idea*.

For theſe mens better Satisfaction, it ought to be conſidered, that it is one thing to have no *Idea*, and another to have no word whereby to *expreſs it*: And again, an *Idea* may be either *General and Obſcure*, or *Particular and Clear*: Yea, that there are few (if any) things in the world, whereof we have ſo clear an *Idea*, as not to be ignorant of as much as we know.

Who knoweth not that the *Sun* is the World's great Benefactor, by three things, *Light*, *Heat and Influence*? Now I ask, *What are theſe Three*? You anſwer, they are *Qualities*. I again demand what is a *Quality*? If you be an *Orthodox Peripatetick*, you will ſay, *a Quality is an Accident by which a thing is denominated* Quale quid. And I pray you, what is this more than St. *Auguſtin*'s and Dr. *Wallis's Somewhat*? Yet have many Ages of the Learned very quietly ſat down by this Definition, till *Deſcartes* expoſed it.

Another Inſtance will bring us cloſer to the Doctrine in queſtion. In our *Minds* are three *Faculties*, *Underſtanding*, *Will and Memory*: Theſe three are not only *Different*, but *Oppoſite*. Between the two former almoſt a conſtant fighting, and often a ſtruggling between Them and the Laſt: The *Memory* frequently obtrudes ſuch things as we Would, but Cannot forget; and in requital, the *Will* often commands the *Memory* to retrieve what it had almoſt loſt. Theſe therefore are *Three*: But *what are theſe three*? You ſay they are three *Faculties*. I again ask what is a *Faculty*? Is it a *Subſtance*? No, it cannot ſubſiſt by it ſelf. Is it then

an

an *Accident?* Neither; for it cannot be abſent without deſtruction of its Subject. What then is a *Faculty?* Tell me what is a Faculty in Man, and I will tell you what is a Perſon in God. It will not be eaſy for you to ſatisfy your Self or me with a clear *Account*, though you have a clear *Idea*; and probably, I muſt reſt in this, that a *Faculty is a Property*, which is the main *exegeſis* whereby the *Greeks* explain the word *Perſon*.

Let us now reſume the ſame way of Dialogue upon the word in queſtion. Our Preſent Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* ſaith, That there are *Three Differences:* You ask what are *theſe Differences?* We confeſs, with St. *Auguſtin*, that we want an adæquate word, whereby to explain what they are: and in this ſtreight, ſince we can find no better, we make uſe of the word *Perſon*, which we can no more underſtand what it ſignifies, than we do the word *Faculty:* And why ſhould we not reſt ſatisfied with the One, in relation to the *Divine Nature*, as well as with the Other, in relation to our *Own?*

Let us therefore look about us, and conſider how we may clear up ſuch an *obſcure Idea:* By ſtudying the word *Quality*, I find I cannot reach any competent *Idea:* But when I know ſeveral ſuch Accidents, as agree among themſelves, and differ from others, by their way of working upon their ſeveral *Subjects:* by comparing them together I frame one Idea, which comprehends ſuch accidents under one common name, which I call *Quality:* So I do not learn the properties of the things by the character of Quality; but I know what is a Quality, by the actions of the things that agree in That Character.

Thus is it alſo in the other inſtance: If I would underſtand what is a *Faculty*; I muſt not lye poring upon the Syllables, but from the operations which I experience in mine own mind, frame a ſuitable *Idea*, which may agree with them all: For things muſt ſhew the meaning of words,

words, but words cannot teach the Nature of things, until they are first suited thereto: Nor do we derive the knowledge of Particulars from that of Generals; but we frame our General Idea's from the consent of Particulars in one Notice.

The way therefore to attain a clear *Idea* of the word *Person* in the *God-head*, will be first to examine Who they are that are so called? And then we shall soon discover what That Title importeth. For one turn of the Eye will inform us better what a man is, than a thousand words.

This way St. *Augustin* thought necessary: He conceived all his labours *de Trinitate* would be defective, if he did not make the *Persons* better known by bringing them to *view*, than he could by *Criticising* upon a vagrant word. Therefore in his *Seventh Book* and *Tenth Chapter*, he proceeded to examine *Who are the Three?* It were to be wished that he had been as successful in the *Performance*, as he was rational in the *Attempt*. His words are these; *When a great man would over-briefly intimate the several properties in the Holy Trinity, he saith Eternity in the Father, Beauty in the Son, Advantage in the Gift: I suppose he meant no other by the* Eternity, *but that the Father hath not a Father from whom he hath his Being: But the Son hath from his Father both Being and Co-eternity. For the Image, if it perfectly contains That whose Image it is, is equal thereto; not That, to it's own Image. In which Image he mentioneth* Speciem, *I believe for Beauty.* ——

That unspeakable embrace therefore of the Father and Image, cannot be without Enjoyment, without Love, without Joy: Therefore that Love, Delight, Happiness or Blessedness, is by him briefly stiled Usus: *And in the Trinity is the Holy Ghost.*

Therefore in that Trinity is the supreme source of all things, and most perfect Beauty, and most blessed Joy: And these Three seem to be determined to one another.

By which discourse of this great Father, we see our *Animadverter* hath done justice to *Greeks* and *Latins*, in leaving

leaving *Relations* out of the one list of variations, and putting it into the other; and justified himself too, by the great Authority of this Father; who though he do not say a *Person* is a mere *Relative*; yea, though he say it is somewhat more, *Lib.* 15. *c.* 6. where he summeth up the whole Doctrine in this short total; *Æternus, Sapiens, Beatus, hæc tria sunt Trinitas, quæ appellatur Deus*; Yet because the *Schoolmen*, as well as our *Author*, generally so pursue this *Hypothesis* as to carry it further; I think it necessary to make St. *Augustin* an example of his own Discourse concerning the word PERSON.

For so we may look upon him as bearing *Two Persons*; the one of a *Father of the Church*, witnessing the sentiments of the *Catholick Church* in his time; and another of a private Doctor discoursing by his own single reason in a point of *Natural Theology*.

To the *Father* we owe *Absolute Belief*, because the least suspicion of his *Testimony* would be an affront to his *Veracity*: But to the *Doctor* we must measure our belief by the *Evidence* which gives right to it.

In this *Latter* Discourse, he is so far from the Person of a *Father* of the Church, that he doth not bear That of a *Christian*; doth not Mention, or so much as Intimate, any *Revelation* of our *Lord*, or any *Apostle*, any word of the *New Testament*, or any *Article* of the *Christian Faith*; but discourseth as a *Philosopher*, upon principles of *Reason*, concerning the *Perfections of God*: And is so far from pretending to declare the *Doctrine* of the *Catholick Church*, that he professeth only to explain the obscure sayings of a (*Great* indeed, but) *Single Doctor*; whose sense also he doth not *Promise*, but *Suppose* himself to understand.

This consideration abateth so much of the Deference which is due to the most eminent of the *Fathers*, as to bring him to a level with any other *Philosopher*; so that if we find him speak like *Epicurus*, we may with as good a grace reject his Dictates, as those of that Philosopher. Let

Let us then ſeriouſly conſider; How could *Epicurus* more graphically deſcribe his *Idle Voluptuous Deity*, than by comparing him to a *Beautiful Lady*, pleaſing her ſelf with the image of her fair Face reflected in a bright ſmooth Glaſs? or how could he give a better account of his regardleſsneſs of the World, than by ſaying, his *Life*, his *Glory*, and his *Pleaſure* are all his intereſt, and theſe are *determined to one another?*

Now I pray thee (Reader) what is all this to thee or me, but a *Diſcouragement* from hoping any good from ſuch a *God*, and conſequently from paying him any Love or Service? Be the *Lady* never ſo Perfect in *Beauty*, her *Glaſs* never ſo exactly clear, her *Delight* in it never ſo raviſhing; What is this to the well ordering of her Family, but an hinderance? A noble, eloquent, and judicious Writer, in his *Advice to a Daughter*, telleth her, that her Servants will more value her *Houſekeeper* than her *Ladyſhip*, if they find ſhe takes no kind of care of them: And ſome will ſay, it is not ſo unreaſonable to Worſhip the *Sun*, who is the worlds great *Benefactor*; as that Sun's *Creator*, if he leaves them without farther regard to their happineſs.

What is thus ſaid of *St. Auguſtin's Hypotheſis*, is no leſs true of our *Animadverter*'s, which indeed is but the ſame in the *Schoolmens* dreſs. What are theſe *Internal Relations*, theſe *Subſiſtences* and *Modes of Subſiſtence*, This *Generation and Spiration*, this *Filiation and Proceſſion*, and the reſt of that *Scholaſtick Jargon*, to Me or any other Creature? And if it have no aſpect upon me, how can it be an *Article of my Faith*, or Object of my *Devotion*, or fuel for my *Love*, or *ſpur* to my *Obedience*, or Curb to my *Luſt*, or any other way worth my regard?

I hope I need not fear to be ſuſpected of ſlandering either St. *Auguſtin* or our *Author*, by charging them with *Epicurus*'s Errors: No, I accuſe not either of *them*, but their *Hypotheſis*; and that, of no other crime but what them-

themſelves profeſs. The former declareth that his three are *determined to one another*; and the *later*, that they are no other than mere *Internal Relatives*; and what is this, but that they regard not the world at all? Our Author maketh this as plain as can be done by words, *Page* 242. *That the Relations which the God-head may ſuſtain, are of two ſorts.*

1ſt. *Extrinſecal, and founded upon ſome External act iſſuing from God, of which ſort are the Relations of Creator, Preſerver and Governor, and the like to the things Created, Preſerved and Governed by him.*

2. *Intrinſecal, and founded upon thoſe Internal acts, by which one Perſon produces another, or proceeds from another: For to produce and to proceed (whether by Generation or Spiration) is that which makes or Conſtitutes a Plurality of Perſons in the God-head.*

From all which it follows, That the Relation by which God as a Creator, or Preſerver, reſpects his Creatures, is extremely different from That, by which God as a Father reſpects his Son.

It is indeed; for the *Former* maketh the *Creatures Correlates*, ſo as to oblige them to Love, Serve, and Obey him as the Author of their Happineſs; but the *Later* having no aſpect upon the *Creatures*, can require no Reflection from them, but leaves All piety toward God in a ſtarving forlorn condition.

HERE therefore is the critical point wherein I cannot but Animadvert upon the Animadverter himſelf. And if I prove not the *Former* (which is External, to be That *Relation*, on which the *Perſonalties* of *God* is founded, as clearly as the *Later* (which is Internal) is impertinent to our *Faith*; I am content to be condemned for Rudeneſs toward St. *Auguſtin* and our *Author*, I add and Dr. *Sherlock* too. For this alſo ſhould mitigate our *Author*'s animoſity, that he is of the ſame Party; ſince *Mutual conſciouſneſs, and*

Self-conſciouſneſs look as much *Inward*, and as little regard the world, as the *Internal Relations* invented by St. *Auguſtin*, poliſhed by the *Schools*, and aſſerted by our *Author*. And ſo I paſs from the unpleaſant work of *Oppoſing*, to that of *Aſſerting*.

AND my firſt words ſhall be imployed in acknowledgements to our *Author* for this good direction, *Page* 109. *The Natural order in which Human Reaſon Conceives and Diſcourſes of Things* —— *proceeds by theſe ſteps. Firſt, we conceive of the Perſon, as poſſeſſed of a certain Eſſence, or Nature, Conſtituting or rendring him what he is. Then we conceive of this Nature as One, which is the Firſt Affection reſulting from Being. After this, we conſider this Being as ſtepping forth and exerting it ſelf in ſome Acts.* One would think that *ſtepping forth* were inconſiſtent with *Internal entertainments*: And by this the *Perſons* give us ſuch an *Ocular view* of themſelves, as will inform us better than any *words* or ſpeculations can do: For hereby we ſhall ſee *Who are the three* whom we call *Perſons* in the *Trinity*: and thereby we ſhall better underſtand what a Perſon is, or perhaps that it is not very material whether we underſtand the word or no.

And in this we are happy, that the *Firſt* and moſt conſiderable queſtion is alſo the *Eaſieſt*; will not put us to the trouble of *Diſputing or Criticiſing*, for it is clearly revealed, 1 *John* 5. 7. *There are three that bear witneſs in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghoſt, and theſe Three are One*: Which words we can hardly miſunderſtand, if we conſider, 1*ſt*. What it is to *Bear Witneſs*. And 2*dly*. Who they are that are ſaid to do it.

Firſt, What it is to *Bear Witneſs*, we learn both of the *Pſalmiſt*, *Pſ.* XIX. who ſaith, *The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament ſheweth his handy-work: day unto day uttereth ſpeech, and night unto night ſheweth knowledge*, &c. and

and of St. *Paul*, *Rom.* I. 19. *That which may be known of God is manifeſt; for God hath ſhewed it unto them: for the inviſible things of God are clearly ſeen, being underſtood by the things that are made.* The ſame is St. *John*'s ſtile, *viz. There are three in Heaven* which give evidence for the being of a *God* (as there are three on earth that bear witneſs for Chriſt, that he is the Son of that God).

And the *Second* Queſtion is yet (if poſſible) more clearly anſwered: *Theſe three*, are, *1ſt.* The *Father*, one that communicates his Being, and loves thoſe who receive it. *2d.* The *Word*, λόγος, *Wiſdom*, and *Reaſon*. *3d.* The *Holy Ghoſt*, who throughout the New Teſtament is celebrated as the Author of *mighty works*. So St. *John*'s meaning muſt be plainly this, That the *Goodneſs*, *Wiſdom*, *and Power of God*, give the World manifeſt evidence of his *Deity*: And theſe Three being Infinite are *One God*.

This explication, as it is moſt conformable to the Scripture ſtile, ſo it is to the Truth of the Thing, moſt *Obvious*, moſt *Natural*, moſt *Intelligible*. And that it is moſt Proper, I appeal to very indifferent Judges, the *Platonick Sophiſts*, who ſay the very ſame *Things* in the very ſame *Words*. *Plato* himſelf was not ſo exact as were his Followers. His words in *Phileb.* are *Wiſdom and Mind, can never be without Soul; wherefore in the Nature of God there is a Kingly Soul, and a Kingly mind.* This the Sophiſts poliſh'd, *Plotinus* treateth at large of τρεῖς ἀρχικαὶ ὑποστάσεις three Principal *Hypoſtaſes*, the *Good*, or the *One*, the *Mind*, and the *Soul*. St. *Cyril* quoteth *Porphyry*, ſaying, *God's Eſſence reacheth To Three Hypoſtaſes*, the *moſt high God*, the *Good*, after him the *Opificer*, and the Third the *Soul of the World*.

Theſe and other *Sophiſts*, though ſometimes they vary *Syllables*, always agree in *Notions*. The Firſt ſometimes they ſtile τἀγαθόν, ſometimes τὸ ὄν, ὂν ὄντων, &c. The Second, ſometimes is νοῦς, ſometimes (as we now heard) δημιουργός, but moſt frequently λόγος, and the Third ψυχή, *The Lord and giver of Life.*

In this only they differ from St. *John*, That whereas He thought not fit to declare what kind of Perſons theſe Witneſſes are, they boldly declare their Characters, even the very ſame which we have heard the *Chriſtian* Fathers give them; they called them Three *Hypoſtaſes*; nay, took further boldneſs to explain That Title by ſeveral exegetical variations.

This our St. *Auguſtin* thought too dangerous a ſtep, eſpecially conſidering that the *Platoniſts*, having no reſtraint from the Religion of their Country, ſlipt into ſuch expreſſions as favoured of *Polytheiſm*. To ſhun ſo great a danger, the good Father thought it ſafeſt to take the other extream: He found by experience, that a Good man, having done a Good work, reflecteth upon it with delight: But ſeveral *Principals*, *Cauſes*, *Opificers*, &c. co-operating in extrinſecal Performances, ſeem to import more than *One Agent*, and ſavour too much of *Tritheiſm*.

That we ſpeak not merely by conjecture, we have his own word: [a] *Liberis verbis loquuntur Philoſophi, nec in rebus ad intelligendum difficillimis, offenſionem religioſarum aurium pertimeſcunt. Nobis autem ad certam regulam loqui fas eſt, ne verborum licentia, etiam in rebus quæ in his ſignificantur, impiam gignat opinionem. Nos autem non dicimus duo vel tria Principia, cum de Deo loquimur: Sicuti nec duos deos, vel tres nobis licitum eſt dicere, quamvis de unoquoque loquentes, vel de Filio, vel de Spiritu Sancto, etiam ſingulum quemque deum eſſe fateamur.* By which words he plainly declareth that in the *Subſtance of the Doctrine* he agreeth with the Philoſophers, but dareth not conform to their *Expreſſions*, leſt he might ſeem to believe as many *Gods*, *as Perſons*; which danger he found no better way to eſcape, than by flying to *Intrinſecal Relations*; which Notion however we have found neceſſary to explode; yet I know not whether it be not more excuſable, than the boldneſs of moſt of the *Greek Fathers*.

[a] *De Civit. Dei.* X. 23.

What

What can be more unjuſtifiable than the Plea which our St. *Gregory Nazianzen* maketh in behalf of the Holy Ghoſt? "[b] The greateſt Theologues among the *Pagans*, and "thoſe who come neareſt to Us, had the ſame *Idea* of him, "though they gave him another *name*, calling him the *Soul* "*of the World* ——— For the Learned of our times, ſome "have believed that the Holy Ghoſt is a *Faculty*; others, a "*Creature*; others, a *God*; others knew not under what "kind of things to reckon him, becauſe of the *reſpect they* "*have for the Scripture, which is not clear in this matter.* By theſe laſt words he did not ſo clearly prove the truth of the Doctrine, as its agreement with the *Platonick* Theology; and what is ſaid concerning the *Third Perſon*, will reach the whole *Trinity*.

[b] *Orat.* 37. *p.* 595.

And it were to be wiſht, that in That Doctrine of the *Holy Trinity*, ſome of the Chriſtian Fathers had not outgone the *Platonick* Sophiſts: For our Great St. *Gregory* giveth them their due in ſaying, *There is but One only Divinity among the* Pagans, *as their beſt Philoſophers teach.* But his next ſtep carrieth him farther than thoſe Philoſophers went. For thus he proceeds. *All Mankind hath but One only Humanity: Yet there are many Gods among the* Pagans, *and not One only, as there are many Men: I anſwer, that in This, the Unity is but in the Thought. Every man is divided from others, by Time, by Paſſion, by Power, which is not in God. This is that, wherein conſiſteth the Unity of God, as I conceive, If this Reaſon be good, thank God; if not, ſeek for a better.*

In theſe words the good Father ſpeaketh more like Dr. *Sherlock*, than a *Pagan Philoſopher* (to ſay no worſe.) For as his Sentiments are very like thoſe of *Self-conſciouſneſs and Mutual Conſciouſneſs*; ſo is his Profeſſion, that he ſpeaketh only his own Conceptions.

[a] *Dogm. Theol. de S. T. lib. 6. cap. 9.*

Nor is this the haſty word of a running Pen; we find him ſpeak it plainer in ſeveral other places, particularly in the 35th *Oration*, p. 562, & 570. wherein he maketh the

Unity

Unity no other than *Specifical*; wherein he agreeth with his great Friend St. *Basil*, as appeareth by the Letter sent him expresly upon This Subject by that Great Father. Yea, that this Opinion was not singular in these two *Fathers*, but almost, if not altogether, common to all the rest, is sufficiently proved (among others) by *Petavius* himself.

Thus we find the old Controversy between the *Greek* and *Latin* Churches revived between these two Doctors: Dr. *Sherlock* with the *Greeks*, makes the Divine Persons differ Specifically: His *Animadverter*, with the *Latins*, maketh them mere Internal Relations; But we also find an Arbitrator, whose Judgment both Sides acknowledge considerable: St. *Augustin* saith, the Philosophers are right in the Doctrine, but too bold in their Expressions: St. *Gregory* referreth to Philosophers where the Scripture is not clear.

And indeed the same Arbitrator is necessary to reconcile the Fathers themselves: not only with one another, but each with himself: So inconsistent are their Sayings in one place, with others in other places upon other occasions.

It is visible that they thought it a diminution to the *Christian Doctrine*, if it should be thought discoverable by *Reason*; so, they rather chose to make it *Unintelligible* than *Rational*: They therefore made the *Philosophers* Serviceable to their *Disputes*, not Teachers of the *Doctrine*.

Thus we find *Justin Martyr*, to a Pagan Emperor vouched *Plato*'s Authority, but with a *Proviso*, that *Plato* learnt it from *Moses*; [a] *Therefore* (saith he) *we do not say the same things with others, but all others speak by imitating what is ours.*

[a] *Apol.* 2.

But others were so far from thinking the consent of *Plato*, a *Disparagement*, that they took it for a *Blessing*. *Eusebius* writ a large Book, which he titled *Preparatio Evangelica*, proving that *Gentiles* and *Jews* believed a *Trinity in Unity*: Our Learned Dr. *Cudworth* hath left us a larger, giving us a full account of the Ancient *Heathen Philosophy*: And

And magnifying *God's Providence*, that their Learned Men, finding the Chriſtian Doctrine ſo agreeable with their own, were drawn thereby the more readily to embrace it, and drew many of their Diſciples after them.

I might vouch many other Eminent *Proteſtants*; and ſome *Romaniſts*. I inſtance but in One, namely *Claudian of Vienna*; than whoſe words nothing can be more clear or emphatical. *Mirari admodum dignè neque, quod ante puerperium Virginis, ante Dei incarnationem, ante hominis reſurrectionem ante prædicationem Sanctæ Trinitatis, in gentibus unitatem ineffabilem, tres in Divinitate Perſonas, laudabili uſu, mirabili ingenio, non imitabili eloquio, quæſivit, invenit, prodidit.*

Indeed, the thing ſpeaks ſo clearly for it ſelf, that it needs no Witneſs: When *Talies* exactly agree, to diſpute their mutual relation, will prove nothing but our own perverſeneſs; which in our preſent caſe will be the more unreaſonable, becauſe the *Platonick Sophiſts* ſpake leſs dangerouſly concerning the three *Hypoſtaſes*, than did ſome of the *Chriſtian Fathers*.

They agree in the leading word *Hypoſtaſis*: but in the explanation of That, the *Chriſtians* employed no exegeſis that carried any aſpect toward the World: But the *Platoniſts*, ſuch as expreſs God to be its Maker and Governor, by the co-operation of three, which they call *Principles*, *Cauſes*, *Opificers*, *&c.* And thereby appear to agree with Dr. *Sherlock*, when he declareth that *Perſons in God ſignify the ſame with Faculties in Man*: And I doubt not, but had the word *Faculty* been *Greek*, the *Platoniſts* would have preferred it above all others, as moſt expreſſive of their Notion.

For as they could no other way contemplate *God*, but in his *Works*; ſo thereby they plainly diſcovered the three *Faculties* (allow me that word) without whoſe concourſe the World could not have been made: But where *Goodneſs*, *Wiſdom and Power* infinite concur, nothing can hinder the Effect.

And

And as these three were both *Necessary and Sufficient*, to make *God* the *Creator* of the World; so is the belief of them for my *Faith and Joy* in him. 1. I cannot doubt but he *Desireth* my happiness, because he is my *Good Father*. 2. I cannot fear he should mistake when he intends to do me good, because he is no less *Wise* to *discern* what will make me happy, than *Good* to desire I should be so. 3. I cannot doubt of his *Ability* to do for me what his *Goodness* desireth, and his *Wisdom* directeth, because he is no less infinite in *Power* to execute, than in *Goodness* to desire, or *Wisdom* to direct. Were any one of these wanting, I must be unhappy even by my fear of being so: But now I want nothing to strengthen my *Faith*, inflame my *Love*, encourage my *Obedience*, and compleat my *Joy*.

Thus far *Natural Religion*. But the *Gospel* leadeth us much farther; And as the belief of the *Trinity* was fundamental for the *One*, so it is for the *Other* Religion; wherein our *Church-Catechism* instructeth so the Child; as to take notice of nothing else in his *Creed*; but to answer, that therein he chiefly learneth *these three things: First, to believe in God the Father, who made me and all the world; and Secondly, in God the Son, who redeemed me and all mankind; And Thirdly, in God the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth me and all the Elect people of God.*

So this is the *Sum* of the *Christian Religion*, That *God* acteth three *Persons*, answerable to the threefold state of Mankind: Our first estate was *Good and Happy*, and *God the Father* was Author of it: The next estate was *Miserable and Desperate*, from this we are *redeemed* by the *Second Person, God the Son*. Our next estate is *Dangerous*, in this we are preserved by the *Holy Ghost*; without whose powerful assistance, we should lose the benefit both of our *Creation and Redemption*, through our frailty and averseness to Goodness.

So,

So, whether we look upon the *Old* or the *New* Creation, we find in theſe three a *Concourſe* of all that is *Neceſſary*, and a *Neceſſity* of ſuch a *Concourſe*. And what is ſaid of the *Phyſician* and *Natural Philoſopher*, is verified in the *Chriſtian* and *Natural Religion*: Where the *One Ends*, *there the Other Begins*: Nor is it more a ſhame to a *Chriſtian* to ſuit his belief to the Principles of *Natural Religion*, than it is to a *Phyſician* to practiſe by the Rules of *Natural Philoſophy*.

Since therefore we find St. *Auguſtin* diſcourſe of the *Trinity* as a Doctrine of *Natural Religion*, i. e. as a Philoſopher; and it is the undoubted priviledge of Philoſophy to be *free*; we are at liberty to judge between him and *Plato*, by ſuch evidences as *Reaſon*, aſſiſted by Scripture, ſhall enable us. We have already found St. *John* and *Reaſon* agree with the *Platonicks*: Whither ſhall we go next? I know not any Authority of ſo great value, as that of the *Church of England*: Thither therefore let us go, and enquire how her *Articles* agree with her *Catechiſm*.

I undertake not to prove that the Compoſers of our *Articles* intended explicitly to conform to the *Platoniſts*: And if they did not, this will be ſo far from a *Prejudice*, that it will be a *Confirmation*. For if Two agree in their Teſtimony, they will be ſo much the more credible, for not having conferred together. Grant therefore that our *Reformers* had no thought of *Agreeing* with *Plato*, yet certainly they had none of *Condemning* him: Never ſaid that the three mentioned by St. *John*, were no more than three *internal Relations*, or leſs than three *Faculties*, or ſo much as three *Spirits*: We are therefore at liberty, and may vouch the Churches Authority with at leaſt as good a grace as St. *Auſtin* did that of the *Scripture*, *Non quia id dicit, ſed quia non contradicit*.

But I am not ſo ſatisfied. I plead her poſitive Aſſent, as agreeing with St. *Auſtin*, that the three *Perſons* are no more than three *Attributes*; but correcting his choice, and naming

Other three, more worthy of That dignity, and preferred thereto by St. *John*.

I therefore ſo quit St. *Auguſtin*'s *Scheme*, as to follow his *Example*, commenting upon the words of our *Church* as he did upon thoſe of St. *Hilary*: but as I have a better *Guide*, ſo do I hope for better *Succeſs*.

THE firſt of our Church's Articles ſpeaks thus:

There is but one Living and True God, without body, parts, or paſſions; of infinite Power, Wiſdom and Goodneſs, the maker and preſerver of all things viſible and inviſible. And in unity of this Godhead, there be three Perſons, of one Subſtance, Power and Eternity, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt.

The *Firſt* and moſt Eſſential notion that we have of God, is, that he is THE BEING. By this he commanded *Moſes* to make him known to the *Jews*, and from *Them* the *Gentiles* learnt it. The *Romans* borrowed their *Jove*, and the *Greeks* their *Jao* from the *Hebrew Jehovah and Jah*.

He is not a *Particular*, but *Univerſal Being*: Not only the *Firſt and Beſt*, but the *Abſtract*, the Source whence all being is participated. This in *Latin* is expreſt by a word coined without *Cicero*'s warrant; and if we may take the ſame liberty in *Engliſh*, we may term it *Being-neſs*, or *Be neſs*. Such a *Being* muſt have all Perfections both in *Kind and Meaſure*; otherwiſe there muſt be ſome *Being* in the *Concrete* without *Beingneſs in the Abſtract*. It muſt therefore have all thoſe Perfections which are mentioned in the Article.

It muſt be *Living*: Becauſe without Life, no Being is Perfect.

True, becauſe what is not True, is nothing.

Eternal, becauſe he received not his Being from any Other: Elſe that Other muſt have had a Being *Before* (and therefore *Without*) Beingneſs it ſelf. And what he did not *Receive*, he cannot *Loſe*: therefore, as he had no *Beginning*, he can have no *End*.

One,

One, becauſe if there were another, he cannot have the Being which that other hath; and ſo, not *All Being*.

Infinite, Becauſe, whatever gives it bounds, muſt be another *Being*.

A Spirit; becauſe *Matter* (as ſuch) is dead and deformed: But hath *life and perfection* in the ſame proportion as it hath *Spirit*.

Without *Body*, *Parts*, *or Paſſions*: Becauſe *Spirit* hath none of theſe.

Maker and Preſerver of all things viſible and inviſible: Becauſe the *Univerſal* ſource, whence all things Viſible and Inviſible receive their particular *Beings*.

This entitleth *God* to the Character of *Father*, which involveth that of *Goodneſs*; Becauſe it importeth *Communicativeneſs*. For he that in the heart of all *Particulars* hath imprinted *Love* to thoſe, to whom they have given life, and Eſpecially upon That account, cannot himſelf be without it toward thoſe, to whom out of mere *exuberance* of *Being and Love*, he hath communicated his own *Being*.

This therefore is the Firſt Perſon, the FATHER, ſtiled by the *Platoniſts* τ' αγαθὸν · and ὂν ὄντων.

II. AND whereas the moſt perfect Being muſt be a *Spirit*; we muſt next conſider, that the Immediate and Eſſential property of a *Spirit*, or (which is another word, but the ſame thing) a *Mind*, is *Thinking*. They are ſo united, that our very Thoughts cannot ſeparate them. We may as well conceive life without brightneſs, as a Perfect *Mind* without *Thought*. When we would moſt emphatically expreſs a man's folly, we ſtile him *Unthinking*: Yet even then, we ſuppoſe him thinking, but to little purpoſe, becauſe without *Conſideration*.

This relation between the *Mind* and its *Thought*, we call *Conceiving*: Becauſe in the *Latin* Tongue, *Mind* is of the *Feminine* Gender: But in the *Greek* it is *Maſculine*, and the

Scripture which was written in That Language, more properly ſtileth it *Begetting*. A *Thought* therefore is no leſs than a *Word Conceived*, or rather *Begotten* in the *Mind*: And a *Word* is no more, nor leſs, than a *Thought* brought forth into the *World*.

Thought therefore, or *Word*, being the immediate Iſſue of the *Mind*, may well be ſtiled its *Firſt begotten ſon*: And ſince the *Iſſue* muſt be of the ſame nature with its *Parent*; therefore if the *Mind* be *Wiſe* in the *Abſtract*, then muſt the *Word* be ſo too; ſo, it will be *Wiſdom infinite*.

If therefore λόγος in St. *John* had been tranſlated *Wiſdom*; it had been no leſs agreeable to the *Letter*, and more ſo to the *Dignity of the Subject*. For *Word* literally importeth a *Tranſient ſound*, but *Wiſdom* a *Permanent Perfection*. That, may be guilty of Folly, or Falſhood: But This cannot be ſo of any Defect. If we compare what *Solomon* ſaith of *Wiſdom*, Prov. VIII. 22. with what our St. *John* ſaith of the *Word* in the entry of his *Goſpel*; we ſhall find that exchange will be no robbery on either ſide. Both the One and the Other will ſpeak of the ſame *Perſon* the ſame *Things* as the *Platoniſts* do: And we believe in him as the *Second Perſon* in the Trinity, the SON.

III. THE *Mind and its Wiſdom* will be little worth, if *weak or unactive*: No better than *Dead* if without *Will*; nor than *Lame*, if without *Strength*. But if *Will* concur with *Power*, there will not fail *Effectual Action*. *Matter* is wholly *Paſſive*, *Spirit* is *Active*; and if *Infinite*, *Omnipotent*.

When the *Spirit of God moved upon the face of the abyſs*, that which before *was without form and void*, was thereby made Beautiful and Fruitful. The *Bleſſed Virgin* was ſatisfied when the Angel ſaid, *The Holy Ghoſt ſhall come upon thee, and the Power of the higheſt ſhall overſhadow thee*. When the *Jews* imputed a miraculous Work to the *Devil*, our Lord anſwered, *He that blaſphemeth againſt the ſon of man ſhall be forgiven*,

forgiven, but he that blaſphemeth againſt the Holy Ghoſt ſhall never have forgiveneſs. St. Peter ſaith, *God anointed Chriſt with the Holy Ghoſt, and with Power, who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppreſſed of the devil.* And of the *Apoſtles* it is ſaid, *God bare them witneſs with ſigns, and wonders, and with divers miracles and gifts of the Holy Ghoſt.* St. *Paul* enumerateth extraordinary Powers with this cloſe; *All theſe worketh the One and the Self-ſame Spirit, dividing to every one ſeverally as he will.* In a word, throughout the whole *New Teſtament*, we find *wonderful works* aſcribed to the Holy Ghoſt as his peculiar.

Such works were in Thoſe dayes neceſſary, that God might *bear them witneſs* who were to Preach down That *Religion of Moſes*, which himſelf had in the like (but inferior) manner eſtabliſhed. But now, when men are to be converted, not from a former *Religion*, but from all *Irreligiouſneſs*; the ſame Holy Ghoſt proportioneth his Aids to our Needs, not by viſible Miracles, but by inviſible Motions; Effectually, yet not Irreſiſtibly, ſo *ſanctifying all the Elect people of God*, as to *keep them by his Power to ſalvation.*

This *Power* is the Third Perſon in the Holy Trinity, ſtiled by the *Platoniſts* Ψυχή, becauſe the *Soul* is the *Lord and giver of life* and activity.

This is our *Church*'s Doctrine, agreeing with that of the *Platoniſts* in every one of the Three *Perſons*; whereof She further ſaith, That they *are of One Subſtance.*

Our pretended Maſters of Reaſon laugh at an *Immaterial Subſtance* as a contradiction; but we need not be aſhamed, whether we take the word in its *Vulgar uſe*, or in its *Philoſophical definition.*

1. In *Common ſpeaking*, we call That the *Subſtance* of any thing whence it receives its value: In a piece of Silk (*cæteris paribus*) the more *Matter*, the more *Subſtance.* But we call him a man of *Subſtance*, not that hath a great

Bulk.

Bulk, but great *Wealth*; and him moſt *Wealthy*, not that hath moſt *Lumber* in his Houſe, but moſt *Gold* in his Coffer. And a *Wiſe Merchant will ſell all that he hath, to purchaſe a Pearl of great price*, though he can hold it between two of his Fingers.

2. The *Philoſophical definition of Subſtance*, ſpeaketh it a a *Being ſubſiſting by its ſelf, and ſupporting Accidents*. And have we not demonſtrated this to be God's Prerogative? Is he not the *Being of Beings, the maker and preſerver of all things?* And are they not all in compariſon of him but as ſo many *Accidents*, which cannot ſubſiſt without *Him*, as He can without *Them?* And doth it not hence plainly follow, that whenever any creature is ſaid to be a *Subſtance*, the word is *Analogical*, juſt ſo far true, as *God*'s Being is communicated?

But becauſe in ſenſible things, *Matter* hath a firmer Subſiſtence than *Accidents*, and we cannot ſee any other being beſides theſe two; therefore our *Senſes* impoſe upon our *Underſtandings*, the *Shadow* of ſelf-ſubſiſtence for the *Subſtance*. And the contradiction really lyeth on That ſide which aſcribeth *Subſtance*, properly ſo called, to any creature, becauſe *God* alone is *Self-ſubſiſting*.

When therefore our *Church* ſaith, That *the Three Perſons are of One Subſtance*, the neceſſary meaning muſt be, that every one of them is an *Eternal*, *Neceſſary*, *Indefectible* Being. God is *Infinitely*, and *Neceſſarily*, therefore Equally, *Good*, *Wiſe*, and *Powerful:* Were he not ſo, he could not be *God*.

If it ſeem contradictious, that an *Emanation* be *Self-ſubſiſtent*, we muſt conſider that the Emanation it ſelf is *Neceſſarily exiſtent*, even as Neceſſarily, as *God* himſelf: He muſt ceaſe to be *God*, if he could ceaſe to be either *Good*, or *Wiſe*, or *Omnipotent:* So that his *Deity* it ſelf conſiſts in every one of the *Three*, as much as either of them depends upon the *Deity*. There is That Circulation between the

the *God-head* and all its *Perſons*, that all Communicate the ſame *Neceſſity of Exiſtence*; and whatever elſe is requiſite to a *Being abſolutely perfect*, which is the *Symperichoreſis* ſo much ſpoken of.

THIS I take to be the true account of our *Churches* Doctrine, wherein our Difference from St. *Auguſtin* is not ſo great as the Reaſons which neceſſitate it. We agree both with Him and all the Greek Fathers, that PERSON in the Holy Trinity ſignifieth no more than PROPERTY: We alſo agree in Two of the *Properties*; in the Third we cannot reſiſt the force both of *Scripture* and *Reaſon*.

1*ſt*. The *Scripture* of the *New Teſtament* Expreſly and Conſtantly maketh *mighty works* the Property of the Holy Ghoſt. We deny not, that to *Him* is alſo aſcribed *Joy*; but not ſuch an *Intrinſecal* Joy as is *determined within the Trinity*, but ſuch as is wrought in the hearts of the Faithful, according to our *Hypotheſis*.

2*dly*. Suitably to Scripture, plain *Reaſon* looketh up to *God* as the Author of all our Enjoyments, and the Object of all our Devotions, which alſo is what our Author ſtileth an *Extrinſecal Relation*.

3*dly*. This is *Natural Religion*, whereto under *Scripture* is our laſt Appeal: St. *Paul* in diſcourſing the *Epheſians*, proceedeth upon Principles of This Religion, wherein all mankind agree; all the reſt of the *Apoſtles* muſt neceſſarily do the ſame, when they Converted any *Gentiles*. God forbid the *Goſpel* ſhould come within the charge which we lay againſt the *Papiſts*, to have one Doctrine for thoſe that are *Without*, and another for thoſe that are *Within*. The known axiom belongeth as well to the Mind as the Body: Faith it ſelf is nouriſhed by the ſame Principles by which it is begotten; nor can That be *Hereſy* in a *Chriſtian*, which the beſt Chriſtians muſt Preach to thoſe, whom they endeavour to Convert to *Chriſtianity*. Suppoſe

Suppoſe we then that ſuch a man as *M. Aurelius* were to be Converted from a Perſecutor to a Chriſtian, How would you diſcourſe him? Would you tell him, he cannot be Saved unleſs he believe that God from Eternity begot a Son Equal to the Father, and from the joint breathing of theſe Two proceeded a Third equal to them Both; and theſe Three circulate infinite Happineſs among Themſelves? What can you imagine the Good man would Anſwer to ſuch a Diſcourſe? Would he not ask, why his eternal Happineſs ſhould depend upon belief of ſuch a Doctrine as hath no influence upon (the deſign of all Religion) *Holineſs of Life?* Would he not further demand, (as a *Deiſt* once and again demanded of My ſelf) Why, or How *God* ſhould beget a *Son?* And why an *Only Son?* If there be ſo much Joy for *One*, why ſhould he not beget *Many*, why not *Innumerable?* Why ſhould he not ask in the *Animadverter*'s words, *Page* 244. *What this Generation and Filiation, this Spiration and Proceſſion are?* Would he be ſatisfied with the Anſwer of the next *Page? That herein conſiſts the Myſtery, and ſuch Myſteries exceed the comprehenſion of Humane reaſon.* Would he not ſpurn at ſuch a Religion, as ſhould require a belief of what is equally *Needleſs and Impoſſible* to be underſtood, as the abovementioned *Deiſt* objected?

But if you offer the Doctrine in a *Rational* Scheme; if you tell him that there is *One God*, infinite in All Perfections; that all the Perfections which we *Can* or *Need* know, are reducible to *Three*; that theſe Three concurred at firſt in *Making*, and ſtill do ſo in *Governing* the World; that theſe are, 1*ſt. Infinite Goodneſs*, which out of exuberance of Being, communicated it to innumerable creatures. 2. *Infinite Wiſdom*, which fitted every kind with Happineſs proper to it's own Nature: And, 3. *Infinite Power*, which executed what *Goodneſs* thought *Beſt*, and *Wiſdom* ſaw *Fitteſt*: Would he have bogled at any of this? And would

And would not This have prepared him for further inſtruction in the Chriſtian Faith, as comprehended in our *Church Catechiſm*, diſcovering the ſeveral actings of the ſame *Three Perſons* in order to our *Eternal Salvation?*

It is certain, for his own Pen aſſures us, that he would not have agreed with the *Chriſtian Fathers*, as they have too much done with the *Platonick Sophiſts*, in entangling the Doctrine with a multitude of difficulties; whereof he thus ſpeaketh in the cloſe of his Firſt Book: *I thank the gods, that having ſuch a Paſſion for Philoſophy, I did not fall into the hands of any Sophiſt: That I did not amuſe my ſelf in reading their Books, or anſwering the vain ſubtilties of their Diſcourſes, nor ſearch for knowledge of Heavenly matters.* Where, that by *Heavenly matters*, he muſt mean the three *Hypoſtaſes*, we cannot doubt, if we conſider, that this was the principal ſubject of the *Sophiſts* Subtilties: And his eſcape from them he juſtly aſcribed to the *Bleſſing of God*, which we alſo ſhall obtain, if we do as this Great man did, who profeſſed, that in all his Studies he aimed at this only end, *viz.* That he might be *Wiſe*: Towards which Happineſs we have a Guide which He wanted; for the *Scripture* is (what Philoſophy is not) *able to make us wiſe unto ſalvation through faith which is in Chriſt Jeſus.* And which of the two Hypotheſes moſt conduceth to Subtilty, which to true Wiſdom, if it be not plain enough, may be made more ſo by comparing them together.

The Animadverter	The Conſiderer
1. Deriveth his Hypotheſis of *Internal Relations*, from the ſingle Authority of St. *Auguſtine* and the *Latine Schools.*	1. *Deriveth his* Hypotheſis *of* Properties, *from the Authority of the ſame St.* Auguſtin, *in conjunction with all other* Fathers *and* Philoſophers ſupported by St. *John.*

The Animadverter

2. Repreſenteth the Three *Perſons*, as mutually careſſing one another, without any regard to the World.

3. Leaveth *Piety* in a ſtarving condition without ſupport.

4. Leaveth the Doctrine unaccountable to any that ſhall examine it upon Principles of *Natural Religion.*

5 Pleadeth Guilty, confeſſeth his Hypotheſis unjuſtifiable, *Page* 247. *Not that I think this ſets the point clear from all Difficulties and Objections: For the Nature and Condition of the thing will not have it ſo, nor have the ableſt Divines ever thought it ſo*, &c.

The Conſiderer

2. *Exhibiteth the Three* Properties *as co-operating for the good of Creatures.*

3. *Cheriſheth all* Graces and Fruits of the Spirit: *Feaſting Pious Souls with* Faith, Hope, Joy, *&c.*

4. *Anſwereth all queſtions, that can be propoſed from* Scripture *interpreted by* Reaſon.

5. *Juſtifieth his Hypotheſis, transferring the blame from the Matter to the Managers; who neglecting the definition of the Subject, turned a plain Doctrine to an obſcure Myſtery, or plain Contradiction. Where-ever that character falls which the* Apoſtle *gives of thoſe* who deſiring to be teachers, know not what they ſay, nor whereof (διαβεβαιοῦνται) they ſpeak magiſterially: *The Later verifieth the Former. They that know not the* Subject, *may talk confidently, yet be ignorant of the* Doctrine.

Hardly

Hardly any *Doctrine*, hardly any *Word* of the *Gospel*, hath escaped tossing by the Schoolmen with their nice *Questions* and *Objections*. This hath no privilege against such treatment; what other Objections may be brought against it, I cannot divine; but what I conceive most obvious I Answer.

Obj. 1. First. I conceive the *Animadverter* may assault me as he doth Dr. *Sherlock*, *Page* 279. —— *I would desire this confident man to look back upon the* Greek *and* Latin *Fathers, Councils, Schoolmen.* —— *I say, I desire him to look all these in the face, and to tell them, That they have hitherto abused the whole world with false Notions of the Trinity*, &c.

Answ. I desire any admirers of former Ages, to look back upon those which were first and most zealously Disputatious in the *Arian* Controversie, and observe how their best affected Historians represent them: [a] *They fought* (say they) *like men in the dark, mutually wondering why they so railed at one another*, &c. Again, I desire them to look back upon all that our Author hath quoted, and see whether any of them have regularly defined the Controverted word PERSON, or made other of it than a *Property*. If they *fought like men in the dark*, the meanest Boy that brings a *Light*, will do better Service than the stoutest Combatant. This I have done, I have brought that light in place which I found in readiness; whether it must be blamed or approved, is left to the judgment of those who stand by.

[a] *Socr.* lib. 1. cap. 18. *Sozom.* III. 12.

Obj. 2. The *Socinians* Object, That this *Platonick Trinity is Pagan.*

Answ. No more than the Doctrine of the *Unity*. Our Learned *Dr. Cudworth* Wrote a Large Volume to prove that, not *Plato* only, but all other *Philosophers*, yea all *Nations*, Worshipped *One only God*; must we take this

as an *Objection againſt* that truth? Is it not rather an *Argument for* it? I am ſure, many of our beſt Divines have agreed with Dr. *Cudworth* for the later, Thus the inquiſitive Dr. *More*, *Myſt. of Godlin. lib.* 1. *c.* 5. §. 7. *We have ſeen how Neceſſary and Eſſential to Chriſtianity the Doctrine of the Divinity of Chriſt is, and conſequently of the Trinity, without which the other cannot be rightly conceived; and therefore we do not only diſapprove of thoſe frivolous Objections and Cavils that would brand this ſacred Myſtery with the infamous note of Paganiſm; but highly magnify and humbly Adore the Providence of God, that That truth ſhould be kept ſo long warm and be ſo carefully poliſhed by thoſe Heathens, that knew not the main uſe thereof, or to what end the Tradition was delivered to the ancient Patriarchs, Prophets, or holy Sages of Old in either* Egypt *or* Judea, *from whence* Pythagoras, *or* Plato *had it; and prepared thoſe parts of the World, where their Philoſophy had taken foot-hold to an eaſy reception of Chriſtianity.*

Of this *Tradition* we have as little *Evidence* as *Need*: We have ſeen how obvious it is to trace the Doctrine by *Reaſon*, though unaſſiſted by *Revelation*: I find the *Platonick Sophiſts* ſpake of it in the very words of the *Chriſtian Fathers*; whether *Theſe* received it from *Thoſe*, or *Thoſe* from *Theſe*, is to me indifferent; becauſe either way it will appear, it muſt be received as agreeable to *Reaſon*.

Obj. 3. IT is further Objected, *That if God's Attributes be Perſons, there will be we know not how many more than Three: For God hath many Perfections and Felicities, whereof we cannot have the leaſt Idea, yet are equally Eſſential to his God-head.*

Anſw. 1. Theſe three we have found are *Neceſſary* and *Sufficient* to anſwer all the Needs of a *Creature*, (which was the utmoſt aim of *Plato*'s Speculations) and of *Fallen man*; which is the ſum of the *Goſpel*.

2. Theſe three comprehend; and to theſe, as to *Categories*

tegories, may be reduced, all ſuch *Attributes of God*, as we can comprehend, or need to believe. For Original *Being* is the ſame with τὸ ἀγαθὸν, and importeth *Eternity*, *Goodneſs*, *Majeſty*, *Infinity*, &c. *Goodneſs* joined with *Wiſdom*, involve *Juſtice*, *Mercy*, *Truth*, &c. *Goodneſs and Wiſdom* joined with *Power*, infer *Creation*, *Providence*, &c. As therefore in our own *Nature*, we ſpeak only of *Three Faculties*, though we have other *Properties*, no leſs *Incommunicable* to inferior *Animals*; as the *Faculty* of *Talking*, *Laughing*, *Gaming*, &c. So in the *Divine Nature*, we give the title of *Perſon* to three only, though there be others Subordinate, and Reducible to them.

Obſ. 4. Some, whoſe minds are poſſeſſed by their Syſtems, and the inveterate notion of a Perſon's being no leſs than what the received definition of an *Intelligent Suppoſitum* makes; may think *any inferior notion guilty of Sabelliſm*: But I

Anſw. The more it ſeems to ſmell of *Sabelliſm*, the more likely it is to be the ſame which the *Latins* heretofore aſſerted. Who comes nearer to *Sabelliſm* than St. *Auguſtin*, and his Follower our *Animadverter*; who proves by good Authority, that the difference between the *Perſons* muſt be *as little as poſſible*? And to ſhew us what diſtance we muſt keep from the dangerous Rock, he faſtens this Buoy for a Mark, *pag.* 287. *Names and Words depend only upon the Will and Pleaſure of the Impoſer; and not upon the Nature of the Thing it ſelf, and for that cauſe neither do nor can internally affect it. But on the contrary, All Modes of Subſiſtence ſpring from the Nature of the Thing or Being which they affect, both antecedently to, and (by conſequence) independently upon the Apprehenſion of the will of any one.* By which Rule we are ſafe enough: For *Goodneſs*, *Wiſdom and Power*, are not mere *Arbitrary* names, but *Really* affect the *Being* wherein they reſide; and the ſhorter they come of *Subſtance*, the ſafer we are from *Tritheiſm*: So that we keep the middle, ſecure

cure from both extreams; And therefore I ſhall with confidence now addreſs my ſelf to all Rational men of what Sect ſoever they be, *Church of England-men*, *Socinians*, *Deiſts*, *Mahumetans*, &c.

The *Chriſtian Religion* is now almoſt 1700 years old, of which time the much greateſt part hath been abuſed in Contentions about the Doctrine of the *Trinity*: And the Diſpute ſo managed, as if both Parties had been ambitious of the Character given by St *Paul*, 1 *Tim.* 1. 7. For who can pretend to Underſtand that there are *three Perſons* in the Godhead, without knowing ſo much as what a *Perſon* is, much leſs *Who is the Perſon?* The *Former* of theſe Queſtions, for ought I know, was never thoroughly diſputed till within theſe four laſt years: And the *Later* (I believe) never till now. But, I hope, they are both now ſo clearly ſtated, that no conſcientious Perſon need ſcruple joining with our *Church* in the Doctrine as ſtated in the *Athanaſian Creed.*

Concerning the *former* Queſtion we have St. *Auguſtin*'s Authority for the ſenſe of the Chriſtian World in his days. If we think not That as authentick as ſome *Claſſical* Author, we may hear the Oracle of the *Latin* Tongue, *Cicero*, thus ſpeaking; *I, who am but One, ſuſtain three Perſons, Mine own, that of an Adverſary, and That of a Judge:* Will any man doubt but *Cicero* was a man, an Adverſary a man, and a Judge a man? yet were not theſe three men, but One man: Why then muſt it be abſurd to ſay, *The Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghoſt God? yet are not three Gods, but One God.* This, if it be poſſible, is yet more clear by our Anſwer to the ſecond Queſtion, *Who are the three?* They are three *Properties in God*, ſome way anſwerable to three *Faculties in Man*, which ſo *Differ* as ſtill to *Agree* in the ſame *Numerical* Nature. *Goodneſs* in *God* is Infinite, and therefore is *God* himſelf; for nothing but

but God is Infinite: The ſame muſt be ſaid of *Wiſdom*, and *Power*: Yet are not Theſe *three Gods*, *but One God*: And why we ſhould not go on with the reſt of the *Athanaſian* Creed, I am not able to frame any colourable Objection.

That which to me ſeemeth moſt like one is this; *That in our Solemn Worſhip of God we muſt beware of any appearance of Prevarication. That the word Perſon hath by long uſe gotten ſuch a ſenſe, as far exceeds what we allow it. If Dr.* Sherlock *have ſtrained it too high, that will not hinder, but it ſtill muſt retain ſo much, as to make the Doctrine a great Myſtery, for ſo the Church of* England *hath always eſteemed it.*

But all this is eaſily anſwered. We do not profeſs *other* mens Faith, but our *Own*; nor can we be ſaid to prevaricate, if we expreſs it in the *genuine ſignification* of the word, though others have perverted it: As for thoſe who engroſs to themſelves the title of *Church of England-men*, with the ſame juſtice as the *Socinians* do That of *Unitarians*, and the *Papiſts*, That of *Catholicks*; we are to conſider that they abuſe the word CHURCH as much as they do the word Perſon.

A *Church* is no other than a *Corporation*: A Corporation ſpeaks not but by its *Seal*; the *Eſtabliſht Conſtitutions* of the Church, are its *Seal*. If therefore thoſe who call themſelves the *Church of England-men* can ſhew any ſuch *Conſtitution*, as declares on the One ſide, that the three Perſons in the *Trinity* are no leſs than three *Minds*; or on the Other ſide, that they are no more than three *internal Relations*; we ſhall then be obliged to Wonder and Acquieſce: But as long as the Conſtitutions of the Church are ſilent, and her moſt eminent Doctors declare, that they are not three *Spirits*, or *Relations*, but three *Differences*, *Properties*, &c. Let all *rational* men be ſatisfied, the *Church* juſtified, and the *ſcandal* removed. I ſhall add to what has been ſaid ſomething concerning the great Doctrine which does depend upon That of the *Trinity*.

Of

Of the Incarnation of Our Lord.

THOSE who concur with a late Writer in his Complaint of the *Chriſtian Religion*, that it *hath not Difficulties and Impoſſibilities enough for an active Faith*; may accuſe me of a great robbery, by depriving it of one of its greateſt; in that I have lower'd the great Myſtery of the *Trinity* from *Difficult*, yea and *Contradictious*, to *Plain and Rational*. But thoſe who ſubmit their *Faith* to no other dictates, but thoſe of *Scripture* and plain *Reaſon*; as they own no other unintelligible *Myſtery*, but that which the Apoſtle declared a great one, *God manifeſted in the fleſh*; ſo they meaſure their Belief and Eſteem of the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, by its ſerviceableneſs thereunto.

Such an one we have found the late Learned Dr. *More*, who admired God's Providence, *for giving the world knowledge of that truth without which the Divinity of Chriſt cannot be rightly conceived.* That whole 5th Chapter of his Firſt Book is well employed in clearing this Point, wherein he thus diſcourſeth, *That Chriſt is not ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος, or a mere Creature, but a Divine Hypoſtaſis —— if a man would not bring his own ſturdy Preconceptions, but liſten to the eaſy and natural air of the Text; the beginning of St.* John's *Goſpel would put it out of all controverſy. For I'll appeal to any, ſuppoſing the union of Chriſt's Humanity with the λόγος to be true, in what fitter, more ſignificant, or better becoming way could it be expreſſed — For why ſhould the Evangeliſt omit the manner of Chriſt's birth as he was man, but that he was intent upon his Eternal Generation as he was God? Or why ſhould he not call him by That name, that was given him at his Circumciſion, or by the name of Chriſt, or the Meſſiah, who was a Perſon expected in time, but that his thoughts were carried back to That of him which was from all Eternity? —— For mine*

own

own part I make no queſtion, but that the Greek *Philoſophers, as* Pythagoras, *and* Plato, *had not only their* λόγος, *but the whole Myſtery of their Trinity from the Divine Tradition among the* Jews. Philo *the* Jew *ſpeaks often of this Principle in the Godhead, calling it* λόγον θεὸν, *or* τὸν θεῖον λόγον, *or ſometime* θεὸν *other ſometime* πρωτόγονον θεὸν υἱὸν. *And attributes unto it the creation of the world, as alſo the healing the Diſeaſes of our Minds, and the purging of our Souls from ſin; inſomuch that this Author might be a good Commentator upon this firſt Chapter of St.* John.

Our excellently Learned Dr. *Scot* ſpeaks more boldly, that to believe otherwiſe cannot conſiſt with belief of the *Evangeliſt's ſincerity.* For in his Notes after his Second Volume of the *Chriſtian Life*, having recited ſeveral Sayings of *Jews* and *Gentiles*, agreeing with the Titles by him given to Chriſt, he argueth in theſe words. " Thus from " firſt to laſt St. *John* diſcourſeth of this WORD, and in " the ſame phraſe and language, gives the ſame account of " him, as the *Jewiſh* and *Gentile* Divines did of Theirs; " ſo that he muſt be ſuppoſed, either to mean the ſame " things by him, *viz.* a Divine Eternal Perſon, or to de- " ſign to make the World believe he meant ſo. For he who " ſpeaks or writes, muſt either equivocate and diſſemble " his meaning, or mean according to the vulgar acceptation " of the words and phraſes he ſpeaks or writes: So that, " ſuppoſing that St. *John* doth here ſincerely expreſs his " own meaning, no man that underſtands the common uſe " and acceptation of his phraſes, can reaſonably underſtand " them otherwiſe, than of a Divine Perſon: And whether " this were not his meaning, at leaſt in all appearance, I ap- " peal to a very indifferent Judge, *viz. Amelius* a Pagan Philo- ſopher, who very well underſtood the Language and Doctrine " of the *Gentile* Schools, concerning the Divine λόγος or " WORD ſo often mentioned in their Writings: And who, caſting his eyes upon this Diſcourſe of St. *John*, doth with all

confidence pronounce this to be the ſenſe of them ; ὅτι ἄρα ἦν ὁ λόγος καθ' ὃν ἀεὶ ὄντα, τὰ γινόμενα ἐγένετο, ὡς ἂν καὶ ὁ Ἡράκλειτος ἀξιώσειε, καὶ νὴ Δὶ ὃν ὁ Βάβαρος ἀξιοῖ ἐν τῇ τῆς ἀρχῆς τάξει τε καὶ ἀξίᾳ καθεστηκότα, πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εἶναι δι' οὗ πάνθ' ἁπλῶς γεγένησθαι, ἐν ᾧ τὸ γινόμενον ζῶν καὶ ὂν πεφυκέναι. i. e. "This was That WORD, who, according to *Heracli-* "*tus*, exiſted from Eternity, and made all things: And "whom by *Jupiter* the *Barbarian* placeth in the order and "dignity of a Principal (or a Beginning) declaring him to "have been with God, and to be God, and that all things "were made by him, and that all things that were, had "life and being in him.

To this our moſt Reverend *Archbiſhop* ſo agreeth as to add, that St. *John* had his eye upon ſeveral others. His *Grace* ſuppoſeth it probable that *Plato* had his notion of the λόγος from the *Jews* ; and that St. *John*, in giving our *Saviour* That Title, *had ſpecial regard to Them who called* the *Meſſiah* by *That name*; and yet more ſpecially to the *Gnoſticks*, *who corrupted the Simplicity of the Chriſtian* Doctrine, *by jumbling together the Conceits both of* Plato *and other Philoſophers*. He cloſeth the whole with theſe words, *I have declared all this the more fully and particularly, becauſe the knowledge of it ſeems to me to be the only true Key to the Interpretation of the Diſcourſe of St.* John *concerning our Saviour, under the Name and Title of the WORD. And ſurely, it is a quite wrong way, for any man to go about, by the mere ſtrength and ſubtilty of his Reaſon and Wit, though never ſo great, to Interpret an ancient Book, without underſtanding and conſidering the Hiſtorical Occaſion of it, which is the only thing that can give true light to it.*

And this was the great and fatal miſtake of Socinus *&c.*

Having ſuch Authority for the truth of this *Key*, let us try it upon the Solemn entry of St. *John's Goſpel*.

We have heard the Learned Dr. *More* demand why the Evangeliſt *ſhould not call our Lord by That name which was given him*

him at his Circumciſion, or by the name of Chriſt, or the Meſſiah ——— *but that his thoughts were carried back to That of him which was from all eternity?* This I ſecond with another demand, Why after the 14th Verſe, wherein his *Incarnation* is proclaimed, we never hear a ſyllable more of the λόγος; were it not, that in all the foregoing Diſcourſe, the Evangeliſt's thoughts were full of the Divinity, as not united to the Humanity? For it is manifeſt, that in all the firſt thirteen Verſes he diſcourſeth of him either as the *Creator* of the World, or *Light* of Man.

In the three or four firſt Verſes he ſpeaketh ſo plainly of him as *God the Creator*, that we find a *Pagan* Philoſopher wondering to meet a *Barbarian* ſo skilful in His *Greek* Doctrines.

The *Platoniſts* give their *Trinity*, among other Titles, That of Ἀρχαὶ, *Principals or Beginnings*, as Cooperators in the work of *Creation*; and he ſwore that the *Barbarian* placed the λόγος in *That order and dignity, as giving to all things Life and Being.*

What Key have the *Socinians* for this ſtrange word? Why they ſay the WORD ſignifieth no more than a *Meſſenger*; and the *Beginning*, no more, than that of his *Preaching*. For thus ſaith one of their late Writers, *This is the ſame with what was ſaid by* Moſes, *In the Beginning God created the heaven and the earth: Both* Moſes *and St.* John *muſt be underſtood as referring in their words to the Subject of which they are writing.* John's *Subject is the Goſpel-ſtate and œconomy; the Subject of* Moſes *is the Creation and firſt Ages of Mankind: Therefore* Moſes *means only the Beginning of the world,* John *means the Beginning of the Goſpel-ſtate.*

Indeed! Doth St. *John* ſpeak the ſame with *Moſes?* The firſt word, I grant, is the ſame; but doth it ſtand in the ſame conſtruction? Doth he ſay, *In the beginning the Word eſtabliſhed the Goſpel-ſtate?* Doth he not four ſeveral times proclaim that he was in the *Beginning*, before he ſpeak

a word of what he did? Had *Moſes* ſpoken of *God*'s work of *Creation*, in the ſame ſtile as St. *John* ſpeaketh of the λόγος, *Longinus* would (perhaps) have admired him, but the contrary way; as ſpeaking in a ſtile not worthy of *God*, but unworthy of a *Man*: Or had St. *John* meant the ſame ſenſe with *Moſes*, he would have given his words the ſame *Form*, *viz. In the Beginning the Word preached the Goſpel.*

Both *Moſes and St. John* (he ſaith) *muſt be underſtood as referring to the Subjects whereof they are writing.* Agreed! *Moſes*'s Subject was the *Creation* of Heaven and Earth, for which the *Exiſtence of God, as Creator*, needed not be Proclaimed, becauſe it muſt be Suppoſed: And therefore the principal Verb was *Tranſitive* upon its proper object. But St. *John*'s Subject was our Lord's *Exiſtence*, not his *Action*; This principal Verb therefore is not *Tranſitive*, but maketh a full ſtop at his Being; and this, no leſs than *four* times proclaimed in four compleat Propoſitions, without the leaſt intimation of any thing done, or to be done, by him.

What a ridiculous Iſſue did the Mountain labour with, if ſo Solemn and Majeſtick a Proclamation bring forth nothing beyond this great diſcovery, That *the Agent was in the Beginning of his Action!*

Since therefore there is neither mention or intimation of any other Subject, that may terminate it; the word *Beginning* muſt be *Abſolute*, viz. *the Beginning of All things*: For if there were any other Being before it, That Being, and not the WORD, would be in the Beginning: And if there were nothing before it, it muſt be *Eternal.*

The word was with God,] which is again repeated in the *Second Verſe.*

If λόγος be here Tranſlated *Wiſdom*, as it very properly may, then doth St. *John* very well agree with *Solomon*, *Prov.* VIII. 22. Where Wiſdom is perſonated, ſaying, *The Lord poſſeſſed me in the beginning of his way before his works*

works of old: I was ſet up from everlaſting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was made. And why may not the ſame ſaying be as ſafely believed from St. *John*, as from *Solomon*?

To avoid ſo convincing an Evidence, a ſtory is invented, *That as* Moſes *was called up to God in the mount, and St.* Paul *caught up to the Third Heaven*; ſo our Lord was taken up to the Father in Heaven to be inſtructed in his Meſſage. And upon this Arbitrary Story do they build with ſuch confidence, as if the Scripture were no leſs clear in revealing this, than it is in either of the other. But what evidence? Even Three or Four ſayings of our Lord, wherein he declareth that *he came from Heaven*, and *from the Father*; which all Ages have underſtood to mean, that he was not (as the Firſt *Adam*) of *the earth, earthy*; *but the Lord from heaven*; and this by his own plain declaration, *John* XVI. 28. *I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world*; *again, I leave the world and go to the Father*: To which his Diſciples could not have anſwered as they readily did, if they had not thought it plainly intelligible of one *coming*, and one *going*; whereas this Tale requireth Two of the one and the other.

That which is moſt urged is *John* III. 13. *No man hath aſcended into heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the ſon of man which is in heaven.* But it is ordinary to expreſs the impoſſibility of an action, by ſaying no man hath done it; and that this muſt be his meaning, our Lord himſelf cleareth by the words immediately following, ſaying, *he is in heaven*: To avoid the force whereof they will needs force the word ὢν contrary to all Grammar and Practice, from the *Preſent* to a *Paſt* Tenſe.

But indeed, to refute ſuch a ſtory is to honour it too much: The ſilence of All the four *Evangeliſts* in a matter of ſuch import, is an abundant confutation. That *Moſes* was called up to the *Mount*, and St. *Paul* rapt up to the

Third

Third Heaven; yea, that our *Lord was led by the ſpirit into the wilderneſs, and there* tranſported by the *Devil* from place to place, *&c.* we find particularly Revealed: And they that require us to believe this *Aſſumption of our Lord*, and build thereon the meaning of the *Evangeliſt*'s, ſo ſolemn a Meſſage; muſt bring us a *Revelation* ſuitable to the weight they lay upon it; till That be done, we muſt take the *Evangeliſt*'s word for the *Doctrine*, not Theirs for the *Story*.

The Word was God,] Here we are told (more truly than pertinently) that the Title of *God* is often given to *God*'s *Repreſentatives*, *Angels*, *Princes*, &c. And that *God* himſelf gave it to *Moſes*, *Exod.* VII. 1. ſaying, *I have made thee a God to Pharaoh, and Aaron ſhall be thy Prophet*: But who ſeeth not that in all ſuch Texts, all danger of miſtake is prevented by the Context; whereas in theſe words of St. *John*, the *Context* plainly Inviteth, yea Compelleth us to take the word in its full ſtrength.

Great advantage is made of the abſence of the *Emphatical Article*, as if that were an adæquate mark of diſcrimination between *God*, *Properly* and *Improperly* ſo called. This is claimed with ſuch confidence by one of their lateſt Champions, that he ſaith, *Every novice in Grammar knows it*: Whereas indeed any one that hath ſo much skill in *Greek*, as in that Language to read this very Chapter, may therein find the Article omitted no leſs than Four times, *viz. v.* 6, 12, 13, 18. In every one of which places himſelf cannot deny the *True God* to be meant. I need not add, though it be no leſs true (and were it as neceſſary as true, I could prove it by a particular liſt,) that in the *New Teſtament* we find the ſame omiſſion in more than Two hundred and twenty places.

All things were by him, and without him was not any (οὐδὲ ἕν) *one thing made that was made.*]

Nothing can be more Emphatical: To expreſs it once in a *Poſitive Propoſition*, is not thought ſufficient: the *Contrary*

trary Negative is added, and both of them ſtrengthened with a careful addition of [*that was made*,] which ſo limiteth as to confirm the Univerſality.

Concerning the Genuine ſence of the now queſtioned Propoſition, if we will not believe Grammar, or the abovementioned indifferent Judge, we muſt refer to the *Sacred Oracles* in other Texts. The *Socinians* vouch ſeveral, but ſuch as do not Confirm, but Oppoſe their own Plea.

New Heavens, *new Earth*, *new Creatures*, &c. can by no means anſwer our Evangeliſt's *All things that were made*. For the word *New* plainly Oppoſeth and Suppoſeth ſome *Old*, and requireth to be underſtood Allegorically: Whereas here, we have not the leaſt glimpſe of *Intimation*, but a careful *Excluſion*, of any other *World*, yea, or any other *Thing* that was made without the *Word*.

On the contrary, *his Grace* hath plainly proved by ſeveral ſayings of other Apoſtles, that St. *John*'s meaning equals the full force of his words; that St. *Paul* puts it out of doubt, by bringing an Inventory of Particulars: In *Heaven* (where ſure the *Word* was more than a *Meſſenger*) as well as in *Earth*; *Inviſible as well as Viſible* (which cannot be ſaid of the *Goſpel-ſtate*) *whether they be thrones*, &c. *All things were created by him and for him*. And in the *Firſt Chapter* of the *Epiſtle* to the *Hebrews*, the *Son* is preferred above the *Angels* (as in other reſpects ſo) in this, that it is ſaid to him, *Thou Lord in the beginning haſt laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thy hands*. That this is meant of the *Goſpel-ſtate*, if any can imagine, let him read on, *They ſhall periſh, but Thou remaineſt*, &c.

And leſt that expreſſion [The *Firſt-born of every creature*,] ſhould be thought to infer, that himſelf muſt be a *Creature*; His Grace ſufficiently prevents that Conſequence by a more plain one of the *Apoſtle*'s own drawing

in

in the words immediately following; *For by him were all things created.* And for the *Apoſtle*'s juſtification in That inference, by the Parallel words of other *Apoſtles*, he proveth that the *Firſt-born*, is equivalent to *Heir*, as *Heir* is to *Lord.* So the *Apoſtle*'s Argument runs ſmooth and ſtrong; Our Saviour is *Heir*, and *Lord* of *All things*, becauſe *All things were made by him and for him.*

This is moſt graphically deſcribed by that Glaſs which God hath hung up in the Firmament to reflect his Perfections, that they may be repreſented to us. *God is Light*, ſaith our St. *John*; the Son is ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης ſaith the other Apoſtle: And the *Third Chapter* of the *Revelations* teſtifieth, that our Lord ſtiled himſelf ἀρχὴ, *the Beginning of the Creation of God:* which words by what we now come from hearing, we muſt not interpret *Paſſively*, but *Actively:* Juſt as the *Platoniſts*, who taught that the λόγος was the *ſecond* ἀρχὴ; the ἀπαύγασμα, ἔκλαμψις, ἀπείλαμψις of the *Firſt*: The plain meaning therefore of the whole muſt be this, That as the *Emanation* of That *Light* which dwelleth originally in the *Sun*, while it ſo iſſueth from That Source, as ſtill to be *with* it, is of the *Same Subſtance*; but as it communicates *Light* and *Life* to the world, it is both the *Beginning and Author* of all, that any Region, or any Corner, or any Creature enjoyeth; ſo is the λόγος *the Beginning and the Author* of all the *Being* that any Creature ever had or ſhall have in heaven or earth.

In him was Life, and his Life was the Light of men.]

From *All things* in General, the *Evangeliſt* proceeds, to inſtance in the moſt Perfect of created Beings that the Viſible World can boaſt; *Life and Light*; and from Our Lord's work of Creation of All things, to that of the *Redemption* of Mankind, which alſo was the Proper work of the λόγος.

Whatever St. *John* ſpeaketh of the λόγος, the *Jews* ſpake of the *Meſſiah*, and under the ſame Title. Among their other

other great expectations this was one, that he would *teach them all things*. That this was the hope even of the Vulgar, yea even of the Female *Jews*, we have evidence from the *Samaritan* Woman's Diſcourſe with our Saviour. *Plato* learned ſo much of it, as to write a Dialogue on purpoſe to prove that we are ignorant of what is neceſſary for us to know; which he cloſeth with a promiſe *that a Maſter ſhould come that would remove the miſt, and teach all things relating to God and man.* The world was now big with expectation of this λόγος; The *Baptiſt was a burning and ſhining light*; his Diſciples ſo eſteemed him, that they inclined to believe him to be the *Meſſiah*; but as himſelf profeſſed the contrary, ſo the *Evangeliſt* voucheth That his teſtimony in behalf of Chriſt. He reciteth the very words of the *Baptiſt*, which the *Socinians* ſo Paraphraſe, as not to allow them ordinary ſence: For they make him to prove *the ſame by the ſame. He was before me in Dignity, for he was before me in Dignity.*

I ſhall not ſtand to vindicate both the St. *Johns* from ſuch trifling, becauſe (to ſpeak ſincerely) I conceive the *Baptiſt*'s recognition doth not prove our Lord to have been (what the *Evangeliſt* declares him to have been, *viz.*) *In the Beginning*: I haſten therefore to that *Proclamation* which revealeth the *Subſtance of the Goſpel*, to which all the foregoing Pomp is Introductory, and which deſerves our utmoſt care to underſtand: It followeth in the 14*th. verſe.*

And the word was made fleſh and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father) full of grace and truth.

How an indifferent Reader would underſtand theſe words, let the above-mentioned *Amelius* be a witneſs, who thus interprets them, καὶ εἰς τὰ σώματα πίπτειν, καὶ σάρκα ἐνδυσάμενον, &c. *That the* λόγος *fell into a body, putt on fleſh and appeared a man; yet notwithſtanding, ſhewed the greatneſs of his Nature; and afterward became God again, as he had been*

 before

before he deſcended into a Body, and Fleſh, and a Man.

The former part of this explication is as exact to the words of the *Evangeliſt*, as it is admirable in the *Myſtery*: But the later part concerning his *becoming God again*, he muſt fetch from the word ἐσκήνωσε: for the primitive σκηνὴ is not ſo properly *Tranſlated* as *Tranſcribed* from the *Hebrew* שכינה which maketh ſo much Noiſe, and ſo many Proverbs among the *Jews*; who (with our *Evangeliſt*) ſeem therein to allude to the words of the Prophet, *Iſaiah* 57. 15. ſaying in the Perſon of God, *I dwell in the high and holy places*, &c. where the Prophet twice uſeth the radical word in a ſence ſo agreeable to that of our *Evangeliſt*'s, that the one gives light to the other.

This I therefore mention to ſhew how the *Philoſopher* from the word ἐσκήνωσε, which ſignifieth not a *Fixed*, but *Tranſient* dwelling, inferred our Lord's return to the State he enjoyed before he deſcended into *the tabernacle of fleſh*.

Hence therefore we clearly diſcover (I ſay) what an indifferent Reader, unbiaſſed by any Sect of *Chriſtians*, but a Stranger, yea an Enemy to All, muſt take for the *Evangeliſt*'s meaning; which therefore we may not reject, unleſs we be thereto driven by cogent evidences to the contrary: And what are theſe?

1. It is ſaid, the *word* ἐγένετο *ought not to be Tranſlated, was* MADE, *but only* WAS, *as in the 6th. v.* yet in the 3*d. v.* it cannot be denied to ſignifie Two or Three times as we Tranſlate it; and the word WAS in the entrance of the whole, is no leſs than Four times expreſſed by another word which is proper for it.

Indeed, the Critical difference between theſe two words is this: That ἦν ſignifies ſimply the thing to be ſuch as is expreſſed: Hereof we find examples enough in the Text now before us. But the word ἐγένετο importeth not only the ſimple Being of a thing to be ſuch as is declared; but alſo a change of it from ſome other State.

Where

Where the Propoſition expreſſeth not the Prædicate, Logick teacheth us to ſupply it with [*exiſtent*] or ſome equivalent word: And in the language of our Tranſlators, ſuch a thing is ſaid to *come to paſs* (*i. e.* from not being to being). Hereof examples are moſt frequent in the Goſpel; as *Luke* 2. 1, *It came to paſs in thoſe days, that*, &c. To the ſame ſence muſt be reduced what is ſpoken of the *Baptiſt* in the 6*th. v.* of our 1*ſt. Chap.* of St. *John*; and of his *Father*. *Lu.* 1. 5. *There was a man*, &c. *i. e.* a man *came to* being.

But whenever it acteth a *Copula* in Categorical Propoſitions, as here it doth, it certainly ſuppoſeth the Subject to *Præexiſt*; and therefore importerh ſomething beyond naked *Exiſtence*, ſome Addition or Change, whereby it is made what before it was not.

The word was made Fleſh (ſay they) i. e. *when he was made*; *which implyeth that he was made, as well in his Subſtance as in his Office: ſo* Adam *was made a living Soul.* But on the contrary, the *Evangeliſt* had ſpoken of a Former Being of the Word: And of *Adam*, *Moſes* ſpeaketh of a double making, firſt of his *Body*, made of the *Earth*; and then that *God breathed into his face the breath of life, and he was made a living Soul*; ſo he was thereby made what he was not before. This (I ſtill repeat it) is the conſtant meaning of the word ἐγένετο; it requireth to be ſo underſtood, as to ſignifie was MADE or BECAME ſomething more than in That Being, which it muſt be ſuppoſed, not now to have firſt received, but formerly to have enjoyed This is the Grammatical difference between the word ἐγένετο ſo often uſed in the 3*d. v.* and the word ἦν more often uſed in the Firſt and Second Verſes: This later importeth Naked Being; the other importeth Being clothed with ſome Addition, if the Propoſition be a compleat one.

But *Slichtingius* (we thank him) alloweth us to read as we do: *For then* (ſaith he) *it will follow, that the Word was not at all before he was made Fleſh: For if he were, and were made fleſh; then he ceaſed to be not Fleſh, and therefore*

ceaſed to be what he was before. Had this Good man never heard of the *Catholick* Doctrine, That *the Godhead is not ſwallowed up by the Manhood, but the Manhood taken into the God-head*; as our Church Teacheth us in Her Second Article, wherein we find That Doctrine explained which we have hitherto aſſerted, and is more fully proved by our excellent *Metropolitan?* to whoſe Sermons I therefore refer the Reader; profeſſing that I have inſiſted only upon *Grammatical* Diſputes, which *his Grace* could not think proper for a Pulpit.

HAVING thus aſſerted the *Truth* of the Doctrine by clearing St. *John*'s word; I now proceed to *Explain* it by doing the ſame ſervice to thoſe of the *Church of England*, in her ſecond Article, whoſe words are theſe.

The Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from Eternity of the Father, the very and Eternal God, of one Subſtance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the Bleſſed Virgin, of her Subſtance, ſo that two whole and Perfect natures, that is to ſay, the Godhead and Manhood were joined together in one Perſon, never to be divided, whereof is one Chriſt, very God and very Man, &c.

The firſt two lines are already proved in the firſt part of this Diſcourſe.

Took man's nature in the womb of a Virgin.]

That the *Spirit of God*, which by *moving upon the face of the Chaos*, impregnated it with ſuch a world, as the more we Underſtand, the more ſtill we Admire; ſhould by *overſhadowing a Virgin*, impregnate her with a Child more than human, and ſo, more capable to become the habitation of God; Reaſon may *Admire*, but not *Contradict*. That with ſuch a Divinely-conceived Child, the *Wiſdom of God* ſhould ſo perfectly unite, as the *Soul* doth with the *Body*, is to Reaſon Aſtoniſhing, but not utterly Impoſſible.

Mr. *Norris* diſputeth with the *Quakers*, that the *Light within us* is more than a *Quality*, and no leſs than the very *Eſſence of God*. And I ſee not how the now-mentioned words of

of the Prophet can otherwiſe be true, which ſay, the ſame God *that inhabiteth Eternity, and the high and holy places, dwelleth alſo with the lowly heart:* Nor indeed can we doubt of this, if in our contemplations of God, our Imaginations do not impoſe upon us; as they are apt to do, by the daily and conſtant impreſſions they receive from ſenſible Objects; We ſee nothing in this world but *Concretes*, and We imagine *God* to be a *Being* endued with ſuch and ſuch Perfections: Whereas indeed *God* is not endued with any Perfection, but is himſelf That Perfection in *Abſtract*, which every Creature partaketh in the *Concrete*, as we have above diſcourſed. Whence it muſt follow, that *God* is in ſome Beings *More*, and in ſome *Leſs*, yet ſtill the *Same God* in Every One. Some partake only *Being*, ſome partake *Being* and *Life*, ſome an *Inferior*, ſome a *Superior* kind of Life: Some with Life receive *Spirit*, i. e. *Reaſon, or Wiſdom*; which alſo ſome partake in a Greater, ſome in a Leſs meaſure: And this is true no leſs in Heaven, than in Earth; *Angels, Archangels*, and all other Orders of Bleſſed Spirits, are what they are by *Participation*, and therefore by *Meaſure*, greater or leſs: But Our Lord aſſumeth this Prerogative, that *God giveth not the Spirit by meaſure unto him.*

Let us now climb as high as we can, we ſhall never reach the heighth of this Expreſſion: Let all the Creatures in *Heaven* and *Earth*, that are, ever were, and ever ſhall be, bring their ſeveral meaſures; let all theſe be *added* together, yea, let the one be *multiplied* by the other; yet the *ſum total* will be a *Meaſure*, and therefore unmeaſurably ſhort of Chriſt; who received it *not by meaſure*, but *Immenſly*. So we cannot deny our Lord to be a *Spirit Immenſe* (which none can be but *God*) without accuſing him of Treaſon againſt his Father's Crown and Dignity, by uſurping his Prerogative

Though I pretend not exactly to deſcribe the *Myſtery*, yet I adviſe to look upon *That* Glaſs which (I now ſaid)

God

God hath hung up in the Firmament, and bids us look upon, as reflecting his Perfections. The *Sun* by its Light communicates himſelf to all his Orb, yet do not all things and places alike enjoy him: None like that glorious brightneſs which immediatly iſſues from him, and dazles our eyes. This is by the Scripture made the emblem of Chriſt, who is ſtiled the ἀπαύγασμα. But no compariſon in This caſe can be exact. The *Sun*, however glorious, is ſtill a *Body;* and as ſuch, is confined to *Place:* His brightneſs therefore cannot deſcend to earth, without dimunution proportional to the diſtance it muſt run from its ſource. But *God* is equally Infinite in *All places*, in the centre of the Earth as in the higheſt Heaven: His *Wiſdom* therefore, when it came to *Dwell* in Fleſh, was not *Impriſoned* in it; but was *Infinite*, even in a *Body*; Himſelf ſaid he *was in Heaven* at the very time when he was *come from Heaven. Infinite Wiſdom* could not be abſent *from God*, when he deſcended to dwell in a Body, by an Union ſo perfect, that it is impoſſible he could have been more in it, than he effectually *was*, and ever will be.

Two whole Natures, that is to ſay, the Godhead and Manhood were joined together in one Perſon.]

The account we have had of the word PERSON may here be very ſerviceable: It will ſtretch no leſs the contrary way: For as we have ſeen that *One Man* may be *Many Perſons*; ſo we ſhall find that *Many Men* may be *One Perſon.*

We have ſeen *Two Men* made *One Admiral* by a joint *Commiſſion*; and we every where ſee many men incorporate into one body by *Patent;* whereby they are *one Perſon in Law:* And in this known ſenſe are *the Godhead and Manhood joined together in One Perſon, whereof is One Chriſt, very God and very man*; A Mediator ſo *Between* Both, as to *be* himſelf Both.

When I thus compare the Union of two *Natures in one Perſon in Chriſt*, I pretend no more than to imitate *Painters*, who picture the brightneſs of the *Sun* by colours made of *Earth*; and therefore crave allowance for ſuch defects as the in-

incompetent Compariſon may be guilty of, ſince the *Myſtery* is above All compariſon. Yet hereby I hope we may plainly underſtand (what is moſt to our preſent purpoſe) how from ſuch an Incorporation, every Member obtaineth a double *Perſonality*: One, as an *Individual*, compleat by it ſelf, and diſtinct from All others; and another, as part of another Body; which Body alſo is another *Perſon*, compounded of many ſuch *Individuals*, as ſo many *Members*.

1. *Every Individual Member retaineth its proper perſonality*, entire as he had it before he became a *Member* to the *Body Civil*. The ſame Name and Kindred, the ſame Body and Eſtate, the ſame Mind and Faculties, *&c.* not one Hair of his Head changing colour, not one Inch of his Stature, or one penny of his Money increaſed or diminiſhed. Thus in our Lord's Union with our Nature, his *Godhead* is not the leſs *God*, nor his *Manhood* leſs *Man*; both *Natures* ſtill remain entire, *Perfect God and Perfect Man*.

This clears the Riddle whereby himſelf poſed the *Jews*. By the one he was *David*'s *Lord*; by the other, his *Son*. Which alſo the Apoſtle applieth to *David*'s Anceſtors. Rom. XI. 5. *Of whom, as concerning the Fleſh Chriſt came, who is over all, God bleſſed for ever.* He was on *Earth* the *Son of Man*, when himſelf ſaid he is in *Heaven*, *John* III. 13. And now, that he is returned thither; however his Body be *glorified*, yet ſtill it is a *Body*; and the *Heavens*, as they have *received*, ſo they muſt *contain* him, till he come again to *judge the quick and the dead*. So, while we believe him *Omnipreſent* as *God*, we believe him *Abſent* as *Man*, otherwiſe we could not expect his *coming again*, as a thing future.

2. *By ſuch an Union of ſeveral Individuals is made another Perſonality, which ſo uniteth the ſeveral Properties, that what before was proper to one, becometh common to all, and every Member of the Corporation.*

Upon this account our Saviour promiſcuouſly uſed both Characters, ſometimes ſtiling himſelf the *Son of God*, ſometimes

times the *Son of Man*. God (we know) hath neither *Fleſh nor Blood*; yet St. *Paul*, the more effectually ro recommend the *Church of Epheſus* to its Elders, ſaith, *God redeemed* it, τῷ ἰδίῳ αἵματι *with his own proper blood*: On the other ſide, *Fleſh and Blood cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven*, yet Chriſt carried it thither, and not only ſo, but ſitteth in the *Throne* of that Kingdom. We profeſs to believe that he is *very God of very God*, yet immediately add, *he was crucified, dead, and buried*; which is the greateſt evidence poſſible that tho we do not always expreſs it, yet we muſt be ſuppoſed to underſtand, that ſuch words, as in ſtrict ſpeaking are proper only to *one Nature*, muſt be extended to the *whole Perſon* as compounded of *Both*; yet ſo as to remember, that the *Natures* are not *Confounded* by being *United*.

THIS is That *Communication of Properties*, which all Divines profeſs to believe, but cannot any other way be ſo clearly accounted for, either in the Doctrine of the *Trinity* or *Incarnation*: Whereof, as the Former helpeth us to underſtand the Later; ſo do Both of them turn upon that Cardinal word, wherein while we heed only That Definition which the *Animadverter* himſelf could not reſiſt, even when his Hypotheſis required it; we find no other way to eſcape a manifeſt Contradiction, but by reſtoring it to its due latitude: We can as eaſily underſtand *Three Perſons* in God, as *Three Faculties* in our ſelves; and Two Natures in one *Perſon*, as Two Men in one *Commiſſion*. And this (I hope) may ſuffice for Vindication and Explication both of the *Athanaſian Creed*, and of our *Liturgy* too.

Yet for the fuller ſatisfaction of ſome who complain of the *Later*, becauſe we therein firſt make our Addreſſes to every one of the Three Perſons ſeverally and ſucceſſively, and afterward to the Second Perſon in Particular, and That under the character of the *Son of David*; it will not be amiſs to make a ſhort remark or two upon what we have ſaid.

Con-

Concerning the *Trinity* (then) we are to remember, that the Sum of That Doctrine is, That there is *One God and Three Hypoſtaſes*. For explication hereof, we have a large Letter written by St. *Baſil* to his Brother St. *Gregory*; wherein he compareth it to *three links of a Chain*, wherein he that draweth *One*, muſt therewith draw the other *Two*: *So there is* (ſaith he) *an ineffable and unintelligible both Community and difference between them, ſo that neither the Continuity of the Nature can be divided from the difference of the Hypoſtaſes; nor in the Unity of the Eſſence is the Propriety of the Notions* (i. e. Hypoſt.) *confounded.*

But why (I pray) is this *Ineffable and Unintelligible?* The difference between the *Preciſive and Negative* Acts of our Underſtanding is very *Intelligible*, and in This caſe, very *Practicable*. Suppoſe I cannot with my hand draw one link without drawing the other two; yet I may fix my eye upon one alone: Every one of the three hath his proper *Idea*; really *Diſtinct*, though utterly *Inſeparable* from the other two: But between the *Faculties* of our Minds there is ſuch *Difference*, that moſt men call it a *War*. For it is much diſputed whether the *Will* do always *Submit* to the *Underſtanding*, or ſometimes *Rebel* againſt it? But others reject the Queſtion as grounded on a falſe Suppoſition. They ſay, theſe Faculties are not *Several*, much leſs *Oppoſite Agents*, but ſeveral *Operations* of the ſame Mind. This, as it puts an end to the ſuppoſed diſpute between the *Faculties*, ſo will it to all their Scruples who think it unlawful to worſhip a *Man*.

We may fully contemplate *God*, either in his *Goodneſs*, *Wiſdom*, or *Power*, abſtracted from the other two: And certainly where I may exerciſe my *Contemplation*, I may addreſs my *Devotion*; As therefore I may contemplate *God's Properties* Jointly or Severally; ſo may I pray to him either as *Three Perſons*, or as *One God*.

And if in *Chriſt*, the *Human Nature* be no leſs inſeparable from the *Divine*, than either of the *Three Perſons* is from the other *Two*; then muſt it follow, that though thoſe Two *Natures* be as Diſtinct as thoſe Three *Perſons*; yet while they are as cloſely United too, though either of them may be *Contemplated*, neither of them can be *Separated* from the other.

As therefore we do not rob God of any of his Perfections when we contemplate his *Wiſdom*, abſtracted from them *All*; ſo do we not give his honour to another, when we worſhip *Chriſt-man* hypoſtatically United to the *Wiſdom of God*.

Why ſhould we ſcruple to follow his own Example? He took to himſelf indifferently, ſometimes the title of *Man*, and ſometimes that of the *Son of God*: The difference is only in Sound, the *Perſon* ſtill the ſame. The *Divine Nature* loſeth not the honour which is paid to the *Human*, only becauſe it is united to the *Divine*.

The Example of the Apoſtles praying to *Chriſt* may be our ſufficient warrant: But we ſee reaſon ſo to *Follow*, as to *Juſtify* their Conduct.

That *God was* thus *manifeſted in the fleſh*, is indeed *a great Myſtery*; but ſuch as hath more of *Wonder*, than *Obſcurity*. The Apoſtle profeſt great aſtoniſhment at That which himſelf preached, that the *Gentiles were made coheirs with the Jews*: This was ſufficiently *Intelligible*; but to a *Phariſee of the Phariſees*, it ſeemed almoſt *Incredible*: And ſuch I take to be the *Myſtery of the Incarnation*, which is not entertained but by *Faith*; and when it is ſo, directs us to *Adore* the Union which we Admire.

Yet for further ſatisfaction of the ſcrupulous, we will for once take the boldneſs toward the *Apoſtles*, to ſuppoſe that they wrote as in *Cypher*; and we, for want of their *Key*, miſt their *Meaning*: Yet when we take their words in their moſt obvious ſence, and ſincerely Conform our De-

votions to their *Dictates* and *Examples* according to our beſt underſtanding; while ſo doing we ſtand firm in our Belief that there is but *One God*, and Worſhip him as *One*; If we ſhould be in an *Error*, our Crime would riſe to no greater heinouſneſs than this, That in caſe he did not (as his word ſeemeth plainly to declare) Debaſe himſelf by Incarnation, we ſhould then believe more of him than really were true. Such an Error, I ſay, if it did cauſe us to believe too much concerning *God*; yet while it robbeth him not either of his *Unity*, or any other of his *Perfections*, cannot ſo highly *Offend* him, as to provoke him beyond all hope of Pardon; nor *Diſhonour* him ſo much, as will That thought of ſuch an implacable Anger againſt a well-intending Miſtake.

But on the other ſide, we are ſure he is ſo tender of *Love and Peace*, as to repute the breach of it a ſin of the firſt rate, moſt oppoſite to his own *Nature*, and the Goſpel of his *Son*, becauſe moſt miſchievous to his *Church*.

The ſum therefore is this; It is moſt reaſonable that if we cannot fully ſatisfie our ſelves, we ſhould weigh the one danger againſt the other; and that, both in reſpect of *Evidence and Conſequence*.

1. In point of *Evidence*: On one ſide you are certain you break the peace of the *Church of Chriſt*, if you Conform not to the *Publick Worſhip of God*: On the other ſide, you do but ſuſpect a danger of loſing your Prayers, by Offering them to one that cannot hear and grant them.

2. In point of *Conſequence*: On one ſide you are in danger of a *Sin*, moſt *Heinous*, becauſe moſt *Miſchievous*: On the other ſide, the worſt is a well-meant *Error*, which drawing no miſchief after it, may plead not only for *Pardon*, but *Acceptance*.

Were you to *Preſcribe* to *others*, nay were you to *Chuſe* for your *ſelves*, in what Form you would Pray; Reaſon would require you to keep at the greateſt poſſible diſtance from

from all appearance of whatever you might ſcrüple; but now, that you have This only choice, whether you will adore God in his *Wiſdom*, (in Communion with the Church which profeſſeth as earneſtly as your ſelves can do, that there is but *One God*) or run into *Schiſm*; it will be in vain to diſpute what is *better or worſe* in it ſelf; your whole duty regards what is *Neceſſary* for Perſons in your circumſtances to do. The fundamental Rule of *Epictetus*'s wiſdom will hold as ſtrongly here as any where; *Conſider what is your own buſineſs, and know that to be your buſineſs which is in your Power.*

This is ſpoken, not that I diſtruſt either the *Truth* or *Evidence* of the abovewritten; but I know the *Variety* of mens palates, and (in moſt) the force of inveterate *Prejudice*.

Some, I hope, will find ſatisfaction in the very *Doctrine* as now ſtated: Thoſe that cannot fully grant their Aſſent and Conſent to the *Doctrine* for it's *own ſake*, may find ſome *Eaſe*, if not full *Cure* of their ſcruples, when they Conform to our Eſtabliſh'd Worſhip for *Peace's ſake*: The Former indeed is the beſt Fruit; but the Later is not contemptible. If I obtain either of them, I have already a ſufficient reward: Yet I hope for a greater from That *Lord* whom I have thus endeavoured to ſerve, and who hath ſaid, BLESSED ARE THE PEACEMAKERS.

FINIS.